

Chant, Robert J., O4017134.
Eng, Charles, O4023791.
Farris, John T., O4013959.
Francis, John K., O4004054.
Hodges, James R., O4023363.
King, Charles R.
Lopes, John F., Jr., O4014586.
McEachin, Daniel A., O4023805.
Mooney, Robert, O4013926.
Riley, John F.
Scott, Charles G., O4012280.
Stewart, John K., O4013929.
Watkins, James E., O4013713.
Weeks, Frederick H., O4015937.
Whitaker, Malvern R., O4009306.
Williams, Patrick M., O4019318.
Wilson, Robert E., O4023615.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Decker, Robert J.
Knight, Bobby M.
Paristeris, George, O1928749.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1954, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Albertson, John N., Jr. Hill, Clifford L.
Buffington, James A. Miller, Vandy L.
Elmer, John D. Rutkoski, Jerome W.
Fletcher, Ronald D.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1954, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Anderson, Gary D.	Friberg, William G.
Atkins, James C.	O4019110
Ayers, Lawrence F., Jr.	Fry, Dudley L., Jr.
Azzolin, Robert A.	Fukumoto, Richard L.
Bartos, Robert E.	Fust, John W., Jr.
Bell, Genn N.	Gillard, Robert W.
Bell, James F.	Gosney, Durward D.
Bender, Rogers A.	Graf, John A., Jr.
Berney, Robert E.	O1930143
Beyer, Robert J.	Graham, Joseph E.
Bittl, Frederick E.	Graves, James R.
Bolton, John W.	Greco, Gerard F.
Bonner, Robert W.	Green, Charles F.
Booras, Danny	Greene, Henry E., Jr.
Boyd, Sidney H.	Greer, Jephtha V., Jr.
Bragalone, Raymond A.	Grider, Roy C.
Brainard, Alfred P.	Grummt, Otto C.
Brizee, Harry A.	Hamel, Robert L.
Brown, Billy A.	Hayward, Arnold C.
Brown, Dallas C., Jr.	Hee, Howard Y. K.
Brown, Dwight K.	Hornsby, Jesse S.,
Burton, James	O4013113
Cantrell, Jack R.	Howden, Charles I., Jr.
Carney, Zach T.	Humes, Richard M.
Caudill, James M., Jr.	Jones, Robert A.,
Caylor, Oscar C.	O4000442
Cecil, William I.	Karl, Victor A.
Chitwood, Thomas E., Jr.	Kennedy, Donald R.
Clair, Melvin W.	Kimsey, Earnest R.
Crowell, Howard G., Jr.	Lauf, Robert C.
Culbreth, Joe A.	Lawrence, Billy G.
Dart, Frederick R.	Linger, Albert F.
Dockler, Gordon S.	Manzoni, Christian J.,
Domenicucci, Louis	O4019241
Dorsey, Valentine J.	Martin, James E.
Eisenberg, Herman S.	McClain, Richard A.
Ellis, Alvin C.	McCoole, Delos A.
Ellison, Henry L.	McCusker, George E.
Farr, Robert A.	McDowell, Billy J.
Ferguson, Robert L.	McKinney, Ralph V.,
Flournoy, Walter T.	Jr.
Fraser, Donald C.	Mellish, James R.
	Mendoza, Joseph A.,
	Jr.
	Mollerus, Fred J., Jr.

Morn, Charles P.	Shamblee, Curtis G.
Morris, Eddie L.	Sharp, Benjamin F., Jr.
Muhlherr, Joseph J.	Shiraishi, James T.
Mullin, Leo R.	Simmons, Eugene F., Jr.
Nidever, Richard L.	Skinner, James E.,
Nolan, John D.	O1928117
Nunziato, John A.	Skladal, George W.
Okita, Harold K., Jr.	Sleppy, Alan E.
Oldmixon, Ralph E.	Smith, Charles W.
Parkinson, William H.	Smith, E. Vernon, Jr.
R., Jr.	Snyder, James E.
Perry, John W.	Spruill, Joseph L.
Pitts, George E.	Tanimoto, Robert H.
Plumbley, William R.	Terry, Richard T.,
Rackley, Jerry D.	O4020572
Ray, Howard	Thayer, James H.
Reemsnyder, Harold S.	Thrash, Melvin C.
Reniker, Gene B.	Tigh, Leland F., Jr.
Rimbach, Douglas O.,	Van Vranken, Robert
O1938635	L., O1929892
Robertson, Jerry G.	Vaught, Ralph R.
Robinson, George R.	Vought, Donald B.
Rome, William D.	Wagner, Rudy J.
Rorke, Donald M.	Waite, Hugh G.,
Ross, Vaughn C.	O4019476
Rowan, George R., Jr.	Walker, Ronald O.
Rowley, Jack H.,	White, Marion F.
O4019750	Whiteside, George W., Jr.
Russell, Dean F.	Wilkie, James B., III
Sager, Robert A.	Willemse, Cornelius W., III
Sauer, George E., Jr.	Williams, Norman H.
Schwarz, Henry E.	Willis, William
Sconiers, William L.	Witek, James E.
Scott, Charles H.	
Scott, William T.	
Seigler, Herbert N.	

Commission, term of 5 years expiring June 19, 1959.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment under the provisions of section 11, National Defense Act, as amended, and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and as brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States:

Col. Louis Jacob Rumaggi, O14900, United States Army.

Col. Howard Ker, O15518, United States Army.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK) laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JUNE 14, 1954.

I hereby designate the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today and tomorrow.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker.

PRAYER

Rev. Walter A. Mitchell, pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our loving Heavenly Father, we praise Thee for all the wonderful memories of what this Flag Day stands for in the life of our country. May the flag of our great Nation continue to wave as an emblem of freedom, democracy, and Christian principles upon which our beloved Nation has been founded.

Our gracious Father, let these days be days when all Members of this House shall personally dedicate their very best to the tremendous task to which they have been called. And let this be a time when, on the right hand and on the left, men and women shall honestly and sincerely seek to know and to do the will of God in every responsibility.

Teach us the courage of patience, the strength of endurance, and the real power of self restraint as is admonished in the Scriptures:

Let us lay aside every weight and the sin which doth so easily beset us and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.

In whose name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 11, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 14 (legislative day of June 11), 1954:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

REAPPOINTMENT

Lampton Berry as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service

John Crawford Brooks John Hay
Jack M. Fleischer Richard N. Meyer

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service

Stephen J. Campbell
Rupert Prohme
Albert A. Rabida

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service

James E. Akins	Joe Lill
George M. Barbis	Alan W. Lukens
Robert T. Burns	Miss Ruth A. Mc-
Roy O. Carlson	London
Joseph H. Cunning-	Julian F. MacDonald,
ham	Jr.
Harold L. Davey	H. Freeman Matthews,
John L. De Ornellas	Jr.
John T. Dreyfuss	Philip C. Narten
James D. Farrell	Joseph B. Norbury, Jr.
Samuel R. Gammon	Frank V. Ortiz, Jr.
III	Raymond L. Perkins,
H. Kent Goodspeed	Jr.
Chadwick Johnson	Birney A. Stokes
C. Dirck Keyser	Richard D. Vine
Miss Paulina C. Kreger	William Marshall
P. Wesley Kriebel	Wright
Samuel W. Lewis	Charles T. York

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION
Warren Atherton, of California, to be a member of the National Security Training

and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 8, 1954:

H. R. 683. An act for the relief of George P. Smyrniotis;

H. R. 2512. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended;

H. R. 2974. An act to extend the time for enrollment of the Indians of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3704. An act to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3876. An act for the relief of Martha Schnauffer Shockley;

H. R. 7061. An act to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 7062. An act to amend the act of April 22, 1944, which regulates the placement of children in family homes in the District of Columbia.

On June 10, 1954:

H. R. 897. An act for the relief of Abul K. Barik;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Martha Farah;

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of Alwine Reichenbauch;

H. R. 1509. An act for the relief of Sahag Vartanian;

H. R. 3145. An act for the relief of Pravomil Vlacil Maly and Jarmila Maly;

H. R. 5210. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, and others; and

H. J. Res. 508. Joint resolution to extend the time for the erection of a memorial to the memory of Mohandas K. Gandhi.

On June 11, 1954:

H. R. 675. An act for the relief of Mrs. Romola Nijinsky and Paul Bohus-Vilagosi;

H. R. 689. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kelko Inouye;

H. R. 737. An act for the relief of Harold Donaghy Bishop;

H. R. 807. An act for the relief of Sister Isabel (Purification Montemayor Maceo);

H. R. 887. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski;

H. R. 1465. An act for the relief of Helga Rossmann and her child;

H. R. 1657. An act for the relief of Antonio Messina;

H. R. 1699. An act for the relief of Rev. Roger Knutsen;

H. R. 1905. An act for the relief of Montgomery of San Francisco, Inc.;

H. R. 3006. An act for the relief of Ruth Irene Ledermann;

H. R. 5616. An act for the relief of Leon H. Callaway and others;

H. R. 5933. An act for the relief of Herschel D. Reagan; and

H. R. 7554. An act to provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3050. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

CIVIL DEFENSE NEED

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish that every Member of Congress had been at my side at 10 this morning, when the sirens sounded for the Washington area's A-raid drill in the schools.

I was in one of the fine schools of Maryland, where two of my boys are enrolled, when the drill began. At the principal's request, I walked the halls of the school to inspect the safety measures being taken.

In room after room, little children from 6 to 12 were on their knees, huddled under their classroom desks, their hands clasped about their heads for protection.

For 10 minutes, until the all-clear, they stayed in this position.

It was a saddening and also a chilling sight to watch.

The pitiful inadequacy of those tiny desks as protection for our children is symbolic to me of the deplorable and inexcusable lag of our preparedness program on the home front.

We are not adequately prepared, and all of us in the Government must share the awful responsibility for our unpreparedness.

In the name of God, Mr. Speaker, must we wait until A-bombs and H-bombs begin to fall, before providing adequate and safe emergency shelters for our children? It is shocking evidence of national complacency in a time of great world peril, that construction is not already completed in every target city of our Nation.

The time to act on this national need is not next week, or tomorrow, but today. Tomorrow may be too late.

MRS. JOSETTE L. ST. MARIE—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 432)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval, H. R. 6452, 83d Congress, "An act for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie."

The bill proposes that Frank P. St. Marie's death in service on March 9, 1943, shall be held and considered to have been in line of duty.

Private St. Marie, then on active service in the United States Army, committed suicide on March 9, 1943, while in confinement because of excessive use of alcoholic beverages. The military department determined that his death was in line of duty, while mentally unsound, and not the result of his own misconduct. The claim of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie for death compensation as dependent mother was denied by the Veterans' Administration on the ground that death was due to the soldier's own misconduct.

It appears that favorable action by the committees which considered H. R.

6452 was based upon disagreement with the determination of the Veterans' Administration and a belief that the military department's determination is entitled to greater weight and should be controlling. The basic issue in this case involves the adjudicative function of evaluation of evidence to determine whether the soldier's death was in line of duty and not due to his own misconduct for purposes of death compensation. The statutory duty of making such determinations is the sole responsibility of the Veterans' Administration. I am informed that the conclusion of the Veterans' Administration in the case is fully substantiated by the evidence of record, and in my judgment it is unwise to adjudicate individual cases by private legislation.

To prefer this case for special treatment to the exclusion of other similar cases would be unwarranted and discriminatory. In this regard, I am advised that during the past 6 years approximately 1,000 claims for service-connected death compensation in World War II cases alone have been denied on the ground that the veteran's death was due to his own willful misconduct. Further, it is understood that there are no dependents of World War II veterans on the death compensation rolls as a consequence of enactment of a private law. Approval of H. R. 6452 could result in the placing of such a dependent on the mentioned rolls, and possibly retroactively for almost a 9-year period. Thus, its approval would constitute a far-reaching precedent which I cannot justify.

I am opposed to setting aside the principle and rules of administration prescribed in the public laws governing veterans' benefit programs. Uniformity and equality of treatment to all who are similarly situated must be the steadfast rule if the Federal programs for veterans and their dependents are to be operated successfully. Approval of H. R. 6452 would not be in keeping with these principles.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 14, 1954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and without objection the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

MRS. ROSE KACZMARCZYK—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 431)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 898, 83d Congress, "An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Kaczmarczyk."

The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Mrs. Rose Kaczmarczyk the sum of

\$4,344, which represents the service-connected death compensation she would have received for the period June 23, 1944, the day following the date of death of her son, William P. Kaczmarczyk, through April 3, 1951, if claim for such compensation had been filed within 1 year after the death of her son and she had been found to be otherwise eligible.

The evidence discloses that William Paul Kaczmarczyk served in the Army of the United States from June 4, 1942, until his death on June 22, 1944. After receipt of notice from the Department of the Army of the death of the serviceman, the Veterans' Administration, on August 25, 1944, mailed a letter to the mother of the deceased, Mrs. Rose Kaczmarczyk, expressing regret over the death of her son and enclosing an application form for death compensation, which gave instructions for its completion and return to the Veterans' Administration. There was no response to the letter by the mother, or anyone in her behalf, until April 4, 1951, the date of receipt of an application by Mrs. Kaczmarczyk for death compensation. Thereafter, she was awarded death compensation at the rate of \$60 per month, effective April 4, 1951, the date of filing such claim with the Veterans' Administration, which is the earliest date from which such benefits are payable under existing law. Payment of such compensation has continued to date.

It appears that favorable action by the committees which considered H. R. 898 was based on the belief that since the claimant could not read English and did not realize her rights, the delay in filing claim should be excused. It is pertinent to note in this connection that on August 11, 1944, the Veterans' Administration sent Mrs. Kaczmarczyk a form for claiming her son's \$10,000 national service life insurance, and that her completed claim for that insurance was returned to the Veterans' Administration 5 days later. Mrs. Kaczmarczyk was thereafter awarded payments for life in the amount of \$66.50 per month, beginning June 22, 1944.

Further, it is indicated in the committee reports that had Mrs. Kaczmarczyk filed a timely application for death compensation she would have been entitled to compensation in the sum stated in the bill for the period from June 23, 1944, through April 3, 1951. In order to have been eligible for compensation during the stated period, Mrs. Kaczmarczyk, in addition to filing a timely claim, would have had to establish that she was the dependent mother of the veteran during that period. I am informed that she has not submitted to the Veterans' Administration evidence—and it is not known whether she is in a position to do so—to establish that during the almost 7-year period under consideration she was in dependent circumstances.

The report of the Senate committee also states their belief that the situation here involved is unique and would not constitute a precedent for future claims. To the contrary, I am informed that there are many other claimants for death

compensation benefits, who, like Mrs. Kaczmarczyk, by reason of inaction on their part within the period established by law, are not entitled to retroactive awards of death compensation. To approve this bill therefore would obviously be discriminatory. As I have stated in the past, it is unwise to set aside the principles and rules of administration prescribed in the general laws governing veterans' benefit programs. Uniformity and equality of treatment to all who are similarly situated must be the steadfast rule if the Federal programs for veterans and their dependents are to be operated successfully.

For the foregoing reasons, I am unable to approve H. R. 898, which would authorize payment of compensation from a date almost 7 years earlier than the date authorized by the general law and in a case where the evidence of record fails to establish that the claimant is otherwise eligible.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 14, 1954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and without objection the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1953

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9077) to amend section 405 of the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1953, to make available to the judges of such District the psychiatric and psychological services provided for in such section, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 405 of the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1953 is amended by inserting immediately before "probation officers" the following: "judges of the district court and the."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMIT INVESTMENT OF FUNDS OF INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8974) to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and ask unanimous consent

that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 35 (1) of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1152), as amended (D. C. Code, title 35, sec. 535 (1)), is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness of the United States, any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Dominion of Canada, any Province of the Dominion of Canada, or of any administration, agency, authority or instrumentality of any of the political units enumerated; or obligations issued or guaranteed as to principal and interest by International Bank for Reconstruction and Development."

Sec. 2. Section 18 (1) of chapter II of the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1072; D. C. Code, title 35, sec. 1321 (1)), is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Bonds or other evidences of indebtedness of the United States, or of any State; or of the Dominion of Canada, or of any Province thereof; or obligations issued or guaranteed as to principal and interest by International Bank for Reconstruction and Development."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN TRUST ACCOUNTS TO BENEFICIARY ON DEATH OF TRUSTEE BY SAVINGS AND LOAN, AND SIMILAR ASSOCIATIONS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 8692) to permit the payment of certain trust accounts to the beneficiary on the death of the trustee by savings and loan, and similar associations in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act relating to banking, banks, and trust companies in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1939 (D. C. Code, sec. 26-204), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. Whenever a deposit, savings account, or share account, which is in form in trust for another, shall be made or held by any person in any bank, trust company, savings and loan association, building association, building and loan association, or Federal savings and loan association, doing business in the District of Columbia, and no other or further notice of the existence and terms of a legal and valid trust shall have been given in writing to such bank, trust company, or other association, such deposit, savings account, or share account, or any part thereof, together with the dividends, or interest thereon, may, in the event of the death of the trustee, be paid to the person for whom such deposit, savings account, or share account was made or held, or to his legal representative."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PARAGRAPH 31 OF SECTION 7 OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1903

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 8973) to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (e) of paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended (47 Stat. 556; sec. 47-2331 (e), D. C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended (a) by striking so much of the first sentence of said subparagraph (e) as reads "and a badge numbered to correspond with the number of said license, neither of which shall", and inserting in lieu thereof "which shall not"; and (b) by striking so much of the second sentence of said subparagraph as reads "and such badge prominently worn upon the driver's breast at all times while", and inserting in lieu thereof "at all times while the licensee is."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT TO REGULATE THE HEALING ART

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (S. 2657) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 39 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929 (45 Stat. 1338, as amended, sec. 2-130, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 39. (a) Any person violating the provisions of this act, except section 2 hereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$100 or by imprisonment for not more than 90 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"(b) Any person violating the provisions of section 2 of this act shall be punished,

for the first offense, by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both such fine and imprisonment; for the second offense, by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment; and for the third and subsequent offenses, by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"(c) For the purposes of subsection (b) of this section, an offender shall be considered a second or subsequent offender, as the case may be, if he previously has been convicted of the offense of practicing medicine or the healing art without a license, either in the District of Columbia or in any of the States or Territories of the United States. After an offender has been convicted of the violation of the provisions of section 2 of this act, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or a subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior conviction or convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in subsection (b) of this section."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 86, REVISED STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1004) to amend section 86, Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 86, Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, as amended (sec. 1-316, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended (a) by striking therefrom the words "person convicted of bribery, perjury, or other infamous crime, nor any", and (b) by adding at the end thereof the following: "Except upon the written approval of the Commissioners, or of an official or officials of the District acting pursuant to rules and regulations issued by the Commissioners, no person who has been convicted of a felony in the District of Columbia or of an offense in any other jurisdiction which, if committed in the District, would be a felony, shall be employed in or by the government of the District of Columbia or any agency thereof."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMISSIONERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO SELL CERTAIN PROPERTY

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 2654) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered, in their discretion, for the best interests of the District of Columbia, to sell and convey, in whole or in part, to the highest bidder at public or advertised sale, real estate now owned in fee simple by the District of Columbia consisting of approximately seventeen and seven-tenths one-hundredths acres of land located in Montgomery County, in the State of Maryland, and described in two certain deeds, namely, (1) a deed made November 7, 1898, from Damaris A. Sellman and Frederick O. Sellman to the District of Columbia, recorded on November 21, 1898, in liber T. D. No. 6, folio 238, one of the land records of Montgomery County, Md., and (2) a deed made April 1, 1899, from Damaris A. Sellman and Frederick O. Sellman to the District of Columbia, recorded April 12, 1899, in liber T. D. numbered 8, folio 141, one of the land records of Montgomery County, Md.

Sec. 2. The said Commissioners are further authorized to pay the reasonable and necessary expenses of sale of each parcel of land sold pursuant to the provisions of this act, and shall deposit the net proceeds thereof in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERGER OF COLUMBUS UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, D. C., INTO THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 3213) relating to the merger of the Columbus University of Washington, D. C., into the Catholic University of America, pursuant to an agreement of the trustees of said universities, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the merger of the Columbus University of Washington, D. C., a corporation organized under the provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1901 edition, which incorporation was altered and confirmed by acts of Congress approved June 11, 1934, and June 18, 1953, into the

Catholic University of America, a corporation organized under the provisions of class 1, chapter 18, of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, which incorporation was altered and confirmed by act of Congress approved April 3, 1928, be, and the same is hereby, approved and confirmed.

SEC. 2. The Columbus University shall upon the approval of this act convey its real and personal property, including any trusts or endowment funds which it has or enjoys, to the Catholic University of America, to be used by it for the students thereof to the same extent and for the same purposes that Columbus University and its students have used or enjoyed the same, or for the general purposes of the said Catholic University of America.

SEC. 3. After the completion of the merger herein provided and after the law students presently enrolled in the Columbus University have completed their courses, but not later than June 15, 1957, the said Columbus University shall be dissolved and no longer operate as an educational institution, and thereafter the law school of the Catholic University of America shall be known as the Columbus School of Law of the Catholic University of America.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to prevent Congress from altering, amending, or repealing the same.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the committee on reporting out this bill. I introduced a companion bill in the House. It is the Senate bill that is before us. The passage of this bill, of course, will complete legislative action.

The purpose of this bill is to approve and confirm the merger of the Columbus University of Washington, D. C., into the Catholic University of America. After the completion of the merger, as provided by this act, and after the law students presently enrolled in the Columbus University have completed their courses, but not later than June 15, 1957, Columbus University shall be dissolved and no longer operate as an educational institution. Thereafter the law school of Catholic University will be known as the Columbus School of Law of the Catholic University of America.

Provision is made for the Columbus University to convey its real and personal property, including any trusts or endowment funds which it has or enjoys, to the Catholic University of America.

This proposed merger has been under consideration for several years by the respective boards of trustees, and it was mutually decided that the merger would be to the benefit and best interests of both institutions, particularly in the field of law. Catholic University has for a long time desired a downtown location for its law school, and it is felt this merger will place the law school in a better financial position and enable the school to give greater service in the field of legal education.

Under date of December 19, 1953, an agreement was entered into between Columbus University of Washington, D. C., Inc., and Catholic University of America, Inc., by duly constituted representatives of both institutions.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSESSMENT OF REAL ESTATE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 7128) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide an immediate revision and equalization of real-estate values in the District of Columbia; also to provide an assessment of real estate in said District in the year 1896 and every third year thereafter, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1894, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide an immediate revision and equalization of real-estate values in the District of Columbia; also to provide an assessment of real estate in said District in the year 1896 and every third year thereafter, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1894 (28 Stat. 282, as amended; sec. 47-604, D. C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended (a) by inserting after the word "Columbia" where it appears the second time in the first sentence of said section the words "Metropolitan Area"; and (b) by inserting between the first and second sentences of said section the following: "For the purposes of this act, the term 'District of Columbia Metropolitan Area' means the District of Columbia, the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church and the counties of Arlington and Fairfax in Virginia, and the counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges in Maryland."

"The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall appoint six discreet persons, who shall be conversant with real estate values in the District of Columbia, as a permanent board of assistant assessors. Such appointees shall have been bona fide residents of the District of Columbia for a period of at least 5 years, except that 2 of such appointees may be persons who have been bona fide residents of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Area for a period of at least 5 years."

(b) Section 2 of such act of August 14, 1894, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this act, the term 'District of Columbia Metropolitan Area' means the District of Columbia, the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church and the counties of Arlington and Fairfax in Virginia, and the counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges in Maryland."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and include in lieu thereof the following: "That (a) the first sentence of section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to provide an immediate revision and equalization of real-estate values in the District of Columbia; also to provide an assessment of real estate in said District in the year 1896 and every third year thereafter, and for other purposes,' approved August 14, 1894 (28 Stat. 282, as amended; sec. 47-604, D. C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended to read as follows:

"The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall appoint six discreet persons, who shall be conversant with real-estate values in the District of Columbia, as a permanent board of assistant assessors. Such appointees shall have been bona fide residents of the District of Columbia for a period

of at least 5 years, except that two of such appointees may be persons who have been bona fide residents of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Area for a period of at least 5 years."

"(b) Section 2 of such act of August 14, 1894, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"For the purposes of this act, the term 'District of Columbia Metropolitan Area' means the District of Columbia, the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, and the counties of Arlington and Fairfax in Virginia, and the counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges in Maryland."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask if the gentleman from Minnesota will take a minute to explain the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from South Carolina, permit me to say to him and to the House that this is to permit the District of Columbia to hire up to two assessors who are not residents of the District of Columbia. The law as presently existing prohibits the hiring of such assessors. The assessor here states that he is having some difficulty in obtaining people who are skilled in assessing and who are residents of the District. The amendment that was just read limits the number of assessors not residents of the District of Columbia but who may be hired by the District of Columbia to two. Does that answer the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 7132) to exempt from taxation certain property of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the property situated in square 724 in the city of Washington, D. C., described as lots 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, and 824, owned by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is hereby exempt from all taxation so long as the same is owned and occupied by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and is not used for commercial purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1091); D. C. Code, secs. 47-801b, 47-801c, and 47-801e).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING PICKETING IN VICINITY OF WHITE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 9344) to prohibit picketing in the immediate vicinity of the White House, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful (1) to parade, stand, or move in processions or assemblages, on any of the sidewalks immediately adjacent to and bordering on the grounds of the White House for the purpose of influencing the actions of any court, officer, or agency of the United States, or (2) to display any flag, banner, or device on any of such sidewalks for such purpose.

SEC. 2. Whoever knowingly violates any provision of this act shall be fined not more than \$100 or imprisoned not more than 60 days, or both, prosecution for such offenses to be had in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, upon information by the United States Attorney or any of his assistants.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, beginning on line 4, strike out "Immediately adjacent to and bordering on the grounds of the White House" and insert "or streets described in section 2 of this act."

Page 1, line 9, immediately after "walks", insert "or streets."

Page 1, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 2. The sidewalks referred to in the first section of this act are the following: (1) The east and west sidewalks of East Executive Avenue and West Executive Avenue, between Pennsylvania Avenue and South Executive Avenue, and (2) any of the sidewalks which border on Pennsylvania Avenue or South Executive Avenue, between East Executive Avenue and West Executive Avenue. The streets referred to in the first section of this act are the sections of Pennsylvania Avenue, East Executive Avenue, West Executive Avenue, and South Executive Avenue which border on the sidewalks described in clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Sec. 2." and insert "Sec. 3."

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, there were two bills introduced, the first one by our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENTRY], and subsequently, one introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. The committee finally made some amendments to the legislation, as suggested, and has reported out the bill, H. R. 9344, which is a substitute bill offered by our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENTRY]. It follows rather generally the language of the act prohibiting picketing of the Embassies, the Capitol grounds and the Supreme Court. I want to pay a compliment to my colleague the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. GENTRY] and our colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], for their authorship of this legislation.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RETIRED POLICEMEN, FIREMEN, AND TEACHERS

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 7853) to permit retired policemen, firemen, and teachers of the District of Columbia to waive all or part of their annuities, relief, or retirement compensation, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person entitled to relief or retirement compensation pursuant to the provisions of section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as amended (title 4, ch. 5, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), or any person entitled to annuity pursuant to the provisions of the act approved January 15, 1920 (41 Stat. 387), as amended, or the act approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 875), as amended, may decline to accept all or any part of such relief, retirement compensation, or annuity by a waiver signed and filed with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent. Such waiver may be revoked in writing at any time, but no payment of the relief, retirement compensation or annuity waived shall be made covering the period during which such waiver was in effect.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPOSED POTOMAC RIVER BRIDGE AT JONES POINT, VA.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 1980) and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Commissioners of the District of Columbia (referred to hereinafter as "the Commissioners") are authorized and directed to construct, maintain, and operate a four-lane bridge over the Potomac River, from a point at or near Jones Point, Va., across a certain portion of the District of Columbia, to a point in Maryland, together with bridge approaches and roads connecting such bridge and approaches with streets, park roads, and highways in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The bridge shall be of deck girder structure with a swing span having a 150-

foot horizontal clearance on each side of the pivot pier and a 70-foot vertical clearance above mean low water, and shall be constructed in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906 (33 U. S. C., secs. 491-498), and subject to the conditions and limitations in this act.

(c) The Commissioners shall request recommendations and suggestions of the National Capital Planning Commission relative to the design of the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads.

SEC. 2. (a) The Federal agencies having control and jurisdiction over lands at or near the site of the bridge shall transfer to the Commissioners, upon their request, any such lands to be occupied by the bridge, approaches, or connecting roads, all as more particularly described in plans of such bridges, approaches, and connecting roads to be approved by the Commissioners, the Commissioner of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, the Department of Highways, State of Virginia, and the State Roads Commission of the State of Maryland.

(b) The Commissioners may acquire by purchase or by condemnation any and all lands, not under Federal jurisdiction or control, in the State of Virginia or the State of Maryland needed for such bridge, approaches, and connecting roads, title to such land to be taken directly to and in the name of the United States. In case a price satisfactory to the Commissioners cannot be agreed upon for the purchase of such land or in case the title cannot be made satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, then the latter is directed to procure such land by condemnation, and the expenses of procuring evidence of title, or condemnation, or both, shall be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this act. Jurisdiction and control over any land acquired under the authority of this act shall be transferred to the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commissioners may make such use of federally owned and controlled lands at or adjacent to the site of the bridge as may be necessary for making borings, performing other preliminary work, routing and rerouting traffic, constructing such bridge, approaches, and connecting roads, and storing materials incident to such preliminary work and to actual construction.

(b) The Commissioners may route and reroute and cause the routing and rerouting of traffic on, and close or cause to be closed, streets, roads, and highways under the jurisdiction of the United States, and negotiate for the closing of streets, roads, and highways by contact with Virginia and Maryland authorities, when necessary in connection with the preparation of plans for, and during the actual construction of, the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads.

SEC. 4. The cost of construction, reconstruction, and repair of all roads which are changed or made necessary as an incident to the construction of the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads, when approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Commissioner of Public Roads, the Department of Highways, State of Virginia, and the State Roads Commission of the State of Maryland, shall be paid out of funds made available for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 5. (a) If requested by the Commissioners, the National Park Service shall remove any planting materials and recreational facilities within the area or areas to be used for the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads, or for construction purposes. The Commissioners may regrade the areas involved so as to conform with plans to be approved by them, the Commissioner of Public Roads, the Department of Highways, State of Virginia, and the State Roads Commission of the State of Maryland.

(b) Upon completion of the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads and the grading of the areas, or prior thereto, when authorized by the Commissioners, and when such operation or operations will not interfere with the construction of the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads, the National Park Service shall landscape such areas in accordance with the plans of the National Park Service approved by the Commissioners and by the Commissioner of Public Roads. The cost of such landscaping shall be paid out of funds made available for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. The sum of \$20,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) the Commissioners of the District of Columbia (referred to hereinafter as 'the Commissioners') are authorized and directed to construct, maintain, and operate a six-lane bridge over the Potomac River, from a point at or near Jones Point, Va., across a certain portion of the District of Columbia, to a point in Maryland, together with bridge approaches on property owned by the United States in the State of Virginia.

"(b) The bridge shall be of deck girder structure with a swing span having a 150-foot horizontal clearance on each side of the pivot pier and a 70-foot vertical clearance above mean low water, and shall be constructed in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 23, 1906 (33 U. S. C., secs. 491-498), and subject to the conditions and limitations in this act.

"(c) The Commissioners shall request recommendations and suggestions of the National Capital Planning Commission relative to the design of such bridge and approaches.

"SEC. 2. (a) Any Federal agency having control and jurisdiction over any land at or near the site of the bridge shall transfer to the Commissioners, upon their request, any such lands to be occupied by the bridge or approaches thereto.

"(b) The Commissioners may acquire by purchase or by condemnation any land in the State of Maryland, not under Federal jurisdiction or control, needed for the construction of such bridge, title to such land to be taken directly to and in the name of the United States. In case a price satisfactory to the Commissioners cannot be agreed upon for the purchase of such land or in case the title cannot be made satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, then the latter is directed to procure such land by condemnation, and the expenses of procuring evidence of title, or condemnation, or both, shall be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this act. Jurisdiction and control over any land acquired under the authority of this act shall be transferred to the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Commissioners may make such use of lands owned or controlled by the United States, at or adjacent to the site of the bridge, as may be necessary for making borings, performing other preliminary work, routing and rerouting traffic, constructing such bridge, approaches, and connecting roads, and storing materials incident to such preliminary work and to actual construction.

"(b) The Commissioners may route and reroute and cause the routing and rerouting of traffic on, and close or cause to be closed, streets, roads, and highways under the jurisdiction of the United States, and negotiate for the closing of streets, roads, and highways by contact with Virginia and Maryland authorities, when necessary in connection

with the preparation of plans for, and during the actual construction of, the bridge.

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Commissioners shall not begin construction of the bridge above referred to until the State of Virginia and the State of Maryland have taken such steps as the Commissioners deem adequate to give assurances that there will be constructed and maintained, by and in such States, such approaches to such bridge as will be reasonably adequate to make possible the full and efficient utilization of such bridge.

"SEC. 5. The sum of \$14,925,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a measure that is of vital interest to the greater Washington area. The Jones Point Bridge, if approved by this distinguished body of legislators, will not only benefit the citizens of Virginia and the District of Columbia, it will also be an important national defense adjunct, providing another means of meeting some of the requirements of Civil Defense Administration.

It is my hope and expectation that the adoption of this measure, which I confidently predict, will be the beginning of the fulfillment of the crying necessity for additional bridges to serve the needs of the people in this area and the Nation. To me the Jones Point Bridge is just a beginning—a recognition, if you please, Mr. Speaker, by the Congress of desperate highway and bridge problems confronting this area. Perhaps next year we will realize our dream of a centrally located span and even, perhaps, another bridge to alleviate the present situation.

Please understand, Mr. Speaker, that I am not minimizing the importance of the Jones Point Bridge. A bridge at that point just below the historic city of Alexandria has been needed for many years. It would provide a complete Washington bypass for those vehicles destined for Maryland and the North and East. But perhaps most of all it is needed to relieve the tremendous truck congestion on the streets of Washington. Such relief would provide better and less hazardous traffic conditions not only for the citizens of the District of Columbia, but for the citizens of my own congressional district who work and find much of their recreation in this city. It would likewise serve those citizens of Maryland who find that driving their automobiles on the streets of Washington entails considerable peril.

May I be permitted to point out to my distinguished colleagues that if this measure authorizing a bridge at Jones Point is passed today and the Senate in

turn acts favorably to the extent that the bridge becomes a reality, a tremendous load of traffic, both truck and passenger, will not enter Washington at all. They will pass across the proposed span just south of Alexandria, enter Maryland, and proceed on their way to northern and eastern parts of the Nation.

May I be permitted also to point out to my colleagues that the bridge, in the unhappy event of an enemy attack, will provide another means of communication so vital to America's welfare.

We are miserably short of such lines of communications in this area. That is why I have sponsored this measure, just as I have sponsored other measures which would provide additional bridges at other points connecting Washington with nearby Virginia. In my considered opinion, these bridges are essential to the successful evacuation of the Nation's Capital in wartime. In peacetime they provide transportation facilities which will relieve and expedite traffic in the greater Washington area.

Mr. Speaker, this measure—the Jones Point bridge proposal—is an important start toward that desirable achievement. I sincerely believe that it will be given favorable consideration here today.

The District of Columbia Subcommittee on Public Service, Streets and Traffic conducted extensive hearings on the subject of bridges across the Potomac River for 2 or 3 weeks. The testimony presented and information conveyed by the witnesses was based on many months of thorough study and planning and not on a sudden impulse, whim, or desire of having additional bridges constructed. The testimony brought out conclusively that additional bridges were needed across the Potomac River. The traffic now crossing existing bridges amounts to approximately 225,000 vehicles a day which is a greater volume of traffic than any other river crossing in the world for the number of traffic lanes available. This problem is getting worse every day. It is estimated that by 1970 the number of vehicles crossing the river will increase to 325,000. The 14th Street bridge today has more crossings than any other bridge in the world.

As mentioned before, this need is clearly established without ever taking into consideration the vital civil defense aspect. Therefore, action must be taken immediately to correct this deplorable condition.

It was also established that at least three additional bridges were needed across the Potomac River. One in the central area and two around the perimeter. The subcommittee was unable to arrive at a conclusion as to where the central area bridge should be located since there was wide area of disagreement among the experts who testified. However, all witnesses were in agreement to the fact that the Jones Point location would serve as one of the perimeter bridges. The subcommittee unanimously approved the Jones Point bridge without taking positive or negative action as to the location of a central area bridge.

With respect to the cost, we must take into consideration that three jurisdictions are involved; namely, the State of Virginia, the State of Maryland, and the

District of Columbia. Congress, as a city council for the District of Columbia, must recognize that not only does this problem exist but they have a responsibility in taking the initiative, working out a solution, and sharing this cost. In fact the Federal Government should bear the major share due to the extensive activities of the Federal Government in the area on which the surrounding communities receive no revenue. I have provided in H. R. 1980 for the Federal Government to pay \$14,925,000 for the main span itself and for the two States and surrounding communities to pay the cost for all approaches, highways, and streets leading thereto. It is very difficult to estimate the exact cost of the approaches to the bridge since many of the highways and streets in the surrounding communities will contribute to the orderly flow of traffic to and from the bridge. However, the direct cost for additional approaches as a result of the bridge will cost the surrounding communities and States several millions of dollars more than the cost of the span itself. Therefore, I can say that the States are paying their fair share and the Federal Government will not be paying more than it should. As mentioned before, the problem before us now is getting more acute every day. Further delay will make a solution even more difficult and costly. We know that the bridges are needed; we know that Jones Point is a proper location; we know the Federal Government is responsible for a certain portion of the cost. We know that something must be done. Therefore, I respectfully urge a unanimous approval of this bill in order that we may start on an orderly solution to these problems.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, to be thought of as the first citizen of one's home community and held high in esteem and respect constitutes an achievement in life equal to any honor than can be given by one's fellow men. Charles Francis Adams, a distinguished gentleman of a distinguished American family, was the first citizen of Boston and of Massachusetts.

Although he was never President of the United States as was his great-great-grandfather and his great-grandfather, and although he was never Governor of Massachusetts as were some of his forebears, nevertheless, he reached the pinnacle of man's respect for man and seemed to occupy a place in the hearts of all. He was a fine individual without attempting to be fine. He was an honorable gentleman without seeking honor.

Standing out vividly, his whole life represents a complete description of the meaning of the word "citizen" in this modern age. He was always on the side of right and was a champion of every

act that would strengthen right in its constant struggle against evil. The tremendous number of activities in which he engaged is forceful testament of the strength and energy and devotion within his heart and mind to do all that was humanly possible for the benefit of mankind everywhere regardless of the individual's station in life. To Charles Francis Adams any human being anywhere represented the work of God, and therefore, commanded primary attention at all times.

As a director or officer of over 50 corporations, his judgment and wise counsel and friendly manner left its mark on our business world. As the treasurer of Harvard University for more than three decades, he molded the pattern of the financial foundation of this great national and international university which, indeed, is an invaluable asset of our American Nation. As a philanthropist, his great name is associated with almost every worthy undertaking. Always he found in his busy day just a little more time for another request for his help.

In 1929, Charles Francis Adams was appointed Secretary of the Navy by President Hoover, and in those days, the Secretary of the Navy was a primary officer in the Cabinet of the President of the United States. It is not necessary for me to describe in detail at this time his many accomplishments for the United States Navy. Above and beyond the things he did is the fact that he was held in the highest respect in the hearts of every naval man from seaman to admiral. In those days the men in the Navy were inspired. In those days Navy morale was solid all the way through. He was beloved by the whole Navy because he knew the discipline of the sea. Having won the Atlantic Cup several times, he was appreciative of the temperament required in the mastery of the sea.

Mr. Speaker, those of us here now who served in the Congress when Charles Francis Adams was Secretary of the Navy knew of his great worth, his great value to his State and his country, his broad background, exceptional ability, and friendly cooperation. During the 4 years Mr. Adams was the Secretary of the Navy, I came to him with many problems and with many requests seeking his help, his cooperation, and his counsel. In all of those times I was warmly received and given complete cooperation in every way. Here was a high official of Government who always tried to find a way to do that which was requested instead of marshaling a coterie of lawyers together to devise ways and reasons for opposing a request. Always when I took to him a request, Secretary Adams focused his attention upon its merits rather than its demerits. He was concerned with how to do something rather than with how not to do it. He was a positive man rather than a negative one.

Possessing a great mind, Secretary Adams possessed the quiet confidence of a man sure and unafraid of his decisions. Everyone who is engaged in public service today and who holds public office now or in the future would profit himself tremendously by a thorough

study of the principles and methods of conduct and service of Charles Francis Adams.

True to the traditions of his famous family, Charles Francis Adams added a distinguished chapter to the powerful imprint on American history made by his outstanding and fascinating family. Because of his life, our America is a greater and finer country. He has added greatly to the luster and respect of the Adams family of Massachusetts. He has left a charming and delightful wife and a splendid son and fine daughter. He was a strong Republican, a faithful Christian, and a loyal American. He was buried in the historic Church of the Presidents in Quincy, Mass., wherein are buried his distinguished ancestors, John Adams and John Quincy Adams, former Presidents of the United States.

Now that his distinguished life has ended and his work is finished, he leaves with us a golden memory of principle, of character, of accomplishment, of courtesy, of fineness which we in our earthly wisdom call greatness.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The death of Charles Francis Adams is a very sad one, not only to Boston and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts but to our Nation.

I first met Charles Francis Adams shortly after I came to Congress, in about 1929. He was then Secretary of the Navy. There developed between us a friendship that has lasted throughout the years. I entertained the deepest respect possible for Charles Francis Adams.

A member of one of the most prominent families in American history, a descendant in a direct line of two Presidents of the United States, he did not rest upon the laurels of his forebears, but he was a great man in his own right. He was a contributor to progress. Charles Francis Adams was not only an outstanding citizen but he was a leader in the field of understanding and progress in every other direction. His love of our institutions and the ideals for which our country stands was evidence on innumerable occasions during his lifetime.

Charles Francis Adams not only led a productive and constructive life but he was a symbol for others to follow.

I join with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] in expressing regret at the passing of this great man, and I also extend my profound sympathy to the loved ones that he left behind.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has so truly spoken of Charles Francis Adams. While I mourn his passing more than I can say, I rejoice that there was a life like his as a beacon for all of those who follow after.

Mr. McCORMACK. Everyone who knew Charles Francis Adams is a better person because they knew him.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, to know him was to be inspired. His cooperative spirit, his constant effort to help others, his countless accomplishments for the benefit of his fellowmen, his day-to-day modesty and the warmth

of his friendship represents the monument which will stand forever among the generations ever streaming into the present.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have known and admired Charles Francis Adams for almost half a century. I have a deep sense of personal loss in his death.

Born in 1866 in the historic city of Quincy, Mass., the birthplace of two Presidents of the United States, John Adams, his great, great grandfather, and John Quincy Adams, his great-grandfather, in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, the grandson of Charles Francis Adams, American Minister to Great Britain during the Civil War, he was destined to play a great part in his community, in his State, and in the Nation.

He served for 2 years as a member of the city council and for 2 years as the mayor of his native city.

In private life he served as a lawyer, as a banker, as a director of many businesses, as treasurer and as president of the Alumni Association of Harvard University for a total of 32 years, and as a moving spirit in many charitable and philanthropic undertakings.

Under President Hoover he served for 4 years as Secretary of the Navy.

He lived up to the great traditions of a great American family.

He was known and respected in all walks of life.

He was often referred to as "the first citizen of Massachusetts."

I knew him well in my college days as an older graduate and friend.

I knew him also on the salt water which he loved, as the successful skipper of all sizes of sailboats, including the cup defender *Resolute*, which he sailed to victory in the international races in 1920.

He helped me when I first ran for Congress.

He was always ready to give wise, kind, and helpful advice, as he did to so many others who trusted him.

He will be greatly missed by a wide circle of devoted friends and admirers.

I join in heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Adams and to all those close to him. They will always, I know, take pride and satisfaction in his outstanding life of service to his fellow Americans.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative

business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9517) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] and myself.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we could have an understanding that should there be a roll call on final passage, the roll call would go over until tomorrow?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I believe we have made that tentative agreement. I do hope, however, that we can get the bill in such condition during general debate and under the 5-minute rule that it can be passed without a roll-call vote.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, with that understanding I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9517, with Mr. McGREGOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement as to general debate the gentleman from Indiana will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Arkansas for 30.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia is our Nation's Capital, it is our Capital, it does not belong to the people in the District of Columbia any more than it belongs to the people of Arkansas, Indiana, Illinois, or anywhere else.

Furthermore, I might state here that I am 100 percent against home rule for the District of Columbia primarily on the basis which I have stated, that it is our Capital. It belongs to the various States of the Union and the people

thereof. Since we have been given authority to reign over the District of Columbia we do owe it to the people of the District to exercise responsibilities commensurate with that authority to rule rightly and well over the District of Columbia and the District affairs.

The public works bill, H. R. 364, which has been recently enacted into law has more or less pointed the way for this appropriation bill now under consideration. I may say that the public works bill was long overdue. The District of Columbia has been underfinanced for a great many years and we were behind particularly in our public works program. It is with these thoughts in mind that the legislative committee saw fit to give us the authority to raise and appropriate such funds as are necessary to adequately finance the Nation's Capital.

Before going any further I want to express my appreciation for the full and complete cooperation which I received in preparing this bill from every member of my subcommittee. The attendance was good, the members accepted their responsibilities and assignments in various projects and worked hard. In my opinion, we have presented here a very, very excellent bill.

The members of the committee took it upon themselves to go out and visit many of the institutions in the District and outside the District but owned and operated by and for the District of Columbia. I may say that seeing is believing. We feel like we gained much by visiting these institutions and seeing first-hand how they were being operated. I feel like this subcommittee has done a good public relations job for Congress. We heard every witness without exception who asked to be heard. We gave them as much time as they requested and we had a very fine group of excellent, high-class witnesses who appeared before the committee. In fact, we were amazed at the wonderful testimony given by the citizens outside of the closed hearings on behalf of this appropriation bill.

It might interest the Members to know that we did not hear anyone testify in opposition to the taxes which are being levied upon them to support the public works program. This shows, I believe, that the citizens of the District of Columbia are thoroughly sold on what their Budget Director and their Commissioners are requesting. No one asked for tax cuts, no one complained about high taxes; they merely appeared on behalf of a wise and judicious expenditure of the funds which they are largely paying.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to take some time to explain the different requests in the bill and the recommendations of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I was greatly pleased to hear the gentleman say that this is our capital. There are certain internationalists and globalists who say that this is the capital of the world. I am glad to

hear the gentleman say that it still belongs to the people of the United States.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Knowing the gentleman as I do, I know he means that sincerely.

The budget estimate amounted to \$172,476,546. The committee bill carries a total of \$168,487,838, or a cut of \$3,988,708, approximately \$4 million. This represents an increase of \$14 million over the 1954 appropriation. We anticipate there will be a surplus of 2½ million at the end of fiscal 1955.

The Federal contribution recommended, of course, by the public works bill and by the Bureau of the Budget, was \$20 million and requires payment of the actual cost for water and sanitary sewers, and as you know, the Government water is metered and the sanitary assessment is equal to one-half the water bill. The committee has seen fit to allow \$16 million in Federal contributions plus water cost of \$1,298,000 and sewer charges of \$192,000, making a total Federal contribution of \$17,890,000, or approximately \$18 million. The reduction of \$4 million in contributions is comparable to the cut of approximately \$4 million from the budget, and the purpose of that was that the Federal Government has to pay interest on the money it appropriates, because it is in the red, it is borrowing money, and since the District of Columbia is going to wind up with a surplus, our idea was to save the Federal Government paying interest on \$4 million which will not be used.

The public works bill does not say that \$20 million has to be appropriated every year; it is just \$20 million over a period of 10 years. It could be \$24 million one year, or \$26 million and \$14 million another, depending how the public works program is progressing and to what extent they initiate it. It only stands to reason that they could not initiate the full-fledged program of public works in one year.

Now, if I am not right on this, I want to be corrected, because I am only interested in bringing out the facts in this bill, and so far as I am concerned, I personally feel that the Federal Government should pay its way, but I am doing this in what I think is the most economical way and the best possible way to do it, with no thought whatsoever on my part and no intention of conniving on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Just on the point that the gentleman referred to with reference to the \$16 million Federal contribution, and correctly, as he has stated, as the result partly of the public works bill which was adopted by the Congress recently, I should like to inquire if the gentleman recalls when this increased authorization was provided for Federal contribution there was a limitation placed in the provision that \$13.5 million of that Federal contribution could be used for maintenance purposes and so forth, and any addition thereto up to the \$20 million would therefore go for capital improvements. The point is that the limitation of \$31.5 million and the

\$16 million that is proposed to be appropriated here leaves then only \$2.5 million of Federal contributions to go into this public works program. The point that I wish to raise here is this: Do you have a budget for the public works program for the next fiscal year and, if so, how much is it?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. How much is the total budget for public works?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Well, now, we have a total budget estimate for capital outlay of \$41,848,460, and we allowed them \$40,372,000.

Mr. HARRIS. The thing that some of us have been quite concerned about, as the gentleman will recall during the course of the debate on the public works bill, was that the reason for that bill was to provide needed and necessary capital improvements for the District of Columbia. We increased the taxes on the people of the District of Columbia in order to meet the Federal contribution, or a share of it. We increased the authorization, but we provided that limitation of \$13.5 million, as it finally was put in the bill, of that amount was to be used for maintenance. I want to get some justification for the committee's action, and I know it must have had justification for its action, because the gentleman has done a very fine job on this bill and for the people of the District of Columbia; but after going through that enormous public works bill, it seems to me that we are winding up the first year with providing by this action that the Federal contribution shall be limited to only \$2.5 million out of a total of what was supposed to have been over \$10 million annually.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The gentleman realizes that I have only 15 minutes to explain all budget requests of the departments of the District of Columbia Government provided for under this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I am sorry to have taken so much of the gentleman's time.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I appreciate the statement the gentleman has made. However, \$9.5 million of this is for operations. We allow them \$5.5 million for public works. Of this contribution \$5.5 million is earmarked for public works and only \$9.5 for operations. We were careful to do that because we did not want them to take all of the Federal contribution and use it for operations.

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to have that explanation by the gentleman. I was sure that there was some explanation for the action taken.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Let me say that I join with my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] in paying tribute to the gentleman for the job he and his subcommittee did in this rather grave problem. But let me say that I share his concern also that at the outset of this public works program which we all recognize and acknowledge is badly needed, in the very first year, after we have made a contract with the District of Columbia in passing the public works bill that there would be a contribution of \$20

million, plus the fact that we are earmarking and insisting that the District of Columbia raise money from taxes to contribute these amounts—and let me say that this is not a criticism, but what disturbs me is that we are starting out and leaving the Commissioners, those charged with the tremendous responsibility of this program, by being \$4 million off base compared with what they had anticipated under the public works program would inure to the District.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his observations. Of course, the Committee on Appropriations has separate jurisdiction from that of the legislative committee. We do not feel we are obligated to contribute a dime merely because the House passed an authorization bill. That does not obligate the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate one dime. However, I have been on the side of the gentleman, I will say, for increasing the Federal contribution. As I said before, I am not in favor of conniving against the District of Columbia. I want the District to be treated as it should be by the Federal Government. I would support a contribution of the full amount if it were necessary. If the gentleman can show me that we are limited to \$20 million a year, then I shall favor giving the District the amount of this surplus this year, because they could not get it next year. But we do not think we are limited in that way. We think we would only be taking the taxpayer's money and turning it over to the District and paying interest on it, when they could not use the money.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It is true, of course, that there has been difficulty in getting this program into operation in the short period of time since the bill became law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield myself such additional time as I may require.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] if they think it would be economically advisable to appropriate money, on which we would have to pay interest, and have that money lie in the Treasury, when we could just as well appropriate the money next year and save that interest. Would these gentlemen recommend that?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would say to the gentleman that I would lean over a little bit and say, "Here is money which you can spend if it is needed, but on the other hand, if it is not spent, we are going to look it over and decide what we shall have next year." Either it will be surplus or it will be expended. Then, may I say to the chairman of the subcommittee, I think the Appropriations Subcommittee rightfully should look it over and decide what should be spent the following year.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman very kindly for those observations, but I must move on.

We have the Department of General Administration. The request was for

\$3,060,000. We allowed them \$2,877,000. That is \$109,000 above the amount they got last year. It is principally to give them \$75,000 for new assessors and \$30,000 for collectors.

We allowed the Metropolitan Police \$148,837 above last year's appropriation, \$60,000 for crossing guards and \$49,400 for 8 motorcycle police. We authorized 25 civilian crossing guards last year, I believe, and we appropriated \$60,000 this time to bring that up to 100. We anticipate that there will be at least an additional 50 man-years for police work on the streets.

I am going to skip some of these divisions unless some questions are asked about them.

In the Public Welfare Department we gave them \$737,336 above last year's appropriation. The increases were \$230,000 for 615 more public-assistance cases, \$350,000 for a new infirmary at the Home for the Aged and Infirm, and other increases particularly for staffing purposes.

In the Department of Vehicles and Traffic, we made a reduction of \$284,365 in the budget estimate but allowed an increase of \$89,000 more than last year's appropriation. That amount was spent principally for traffic lights. We eliminated \$269,000 for a fringe-parking experiment.

For the Department of Sanitary Engineering, the budget requested \$9,767,686. We allowed \$9,657,740, a cut of \$109,946 below the budget estimate, although it was above the 1954 appropriation by \$992,349. Of this increase \$745,229 was for hourly wage increases approved this year, \$150,000 for the Revenue Branch, covering the new sanitary sewer charge, water rates, and so forth, and \$140,000 for the operation of a new incinerator.

The big item of increase was for capital outlay. We allowed them \$40,372,000 of the \$41,848,460 requested. I can give you some of the items in this capital-outlay program.

For public buildings construction there are 2 new junior high schools, 1 at Minnesota Avenue and Foote Street NE, and the other at Fourth and Mississippi Avenue SE. There was the construction of additions to 3 elementary schools: Patterson, Draper, and Sheppard; the replacement of the Van Ness Elementary School; construction of a stadium for the Calvin Coolidge Senior High School; plans and specifications for 3 additional elementary schools; funds for the acquisition of a site for the Amidon-Greenleaf Elementary School.

As to libraries, there was the construction of a branch library at Anacostia and plans and specifications for a branch library at Woodridge, public health buildings, construction of a new tuberculosis building, and a new psychiatric building for the District of Columbia General Hospital, public welfare, continuation of construction program already started at Children's Center Village at Laurel.

On highways, East Capitol Street bridge and approaches, Department of Sanitary Engineering, continuation of construction of trunk water mains sew-

age treatment and disposal facilities, storm sewers and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, that is as much time as I care to take now although during general debate, I will try to answer any questions that may be brought up.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think, as a whole, this is a good bill. It is not as I would have written it entirely had I had the authority to write it, but collectively and looking at it as a whole, it is just as good, I think, as any other committee could bring in. At this point, I want to say we have a splendid committee. The majority members have been good to the minority. We have a good clerk too, in the person of Carson Culp. In working with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and its employees, I have discovered that they are real good, conscientious, intelligent people. I think what this committee is trying to do in the main is to let the District of Columbia spend its money as it desires. That is what we tried to do. The public works program has been mentioned here this morning. As I understand the actions of the committee, regarding the public works program, there are only 2 items in the program constituting the reductions made: 1. We believe they can actually secure contracts now for the work planned in the next fiscal year for at less money than the estimates made a year ago and, also, that the purchase of certain real estate for use subsequent to next fiscal year could be deferred.

One word about authorization. Had I been writing the bill, and my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ], I think will explain his position in the matter, I might have recommended a little more money than the \$16 million that is carried in the bill. But unless you increase the individual items of expenditure, if they had a billion dollars more money, they could not use it. There is no reason to place money in the bill that cannot be used during the next fiscal year 1955. If you are going to increase the Federal contribution—and I say this and think I am correct in it—if you are going to increase the contribution, then you ought to select the items of expenditures that will equal the increase, otherwise the money will just remain unexpended during the next fiscal year. Under our figures they should have a surplus from 1954 of \$2,366,833.

A word about the contract which I have heard mentioned here this morning. There is no contract with anybody; you know that. Yes, there is an authorization. I voted for it. I am anxious to see that the District of Columbia gets every dollar, and probably more, than the public-works bill provides, if they need it. It may be that the District will need more money next year. If so, it should have it. Probably over the life of the construction of the authorized program they should have the total of the authorization, if they need it. Certainly there is no effort to take anything from the District insofar as I am concerned. This action is to defer for the time being

of a small part of the authorized appropriation for the next fiscal year because under the bill the District will not need the money. If the expenditures are increased over that recommended in the bill, then, of course, they will need more money to equal same. But there is not a congressional district in this country that has not also had an authorization of money, and some of those authorizations have never been appropriated for and probably never will be. So there is not a contract, but there is a desire on the part of all of us to treat the District of Columbia like we want our Nation's Capital treated; that is, if we err on the side of either, the Nation or the Nation's Capital, as far as I am concerned, I want to err on the side of the Nation's Capital. But there is no error, as I see it. I think this is a good bill, and with but one exception, I am inclined to go along with it, although I was not absolutely in agreement with many items in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

There is an item that I am going to try to increase a little. A year ago the District Commissioners extended an invitation for the American Legion Convention to meet in Washington this year. The Commissioners, as a further inducement to secure the Legion convention this year, said they would recommend to us that the District advance to the Legion the sum of \$25,000, which would be repaid to the District, if the money is available, after the convention. However, under all the circumstances, I think we should appropriate the money. The money should certainly be paid back, and I believe it will be fully paid. This is not something new. Prior to World War II the American Legion required a check in advance in amount of \$27,000 before awarding the convention to a city. In 1947 the State of New York appropriated \$50,000; Florida, in 1948, paid the sum of \$50,000; in 1949, Philadelphia advanced \$50,000; and in all the years of 1949 through and including 1953, all convention cities made advances in excess of the amounts desired from the District. Much of the money advanced through these years were refunded, and I believe that this \$25,000 would be refunded to the District. The Commissioners want the appropriation. We have a budget estimate from the President for the same, and it is District of Columbia money. They should be permitted to carry out their part of a good contract.

With that one exception, as far as I am concerned, I am in favor of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call attention to the fact that an authorization bill is not a contract, and the only thing that should or does inspire an Appropriations Committee is what is the right and fair thing to do.

I am just going to give a couple of figures that are interesting. The Federal contribution last year in the 1954 bill was \$11 million. The total appropriation was a little over \$153 million. The contribution was 7.6 percent of the total. The 1955 bill carries a contribution of \$16 million. The total appropriation is \$168 million plus. The contribution is 9.44 percent of the total. Sixteen million in 1955 represents an increase of 45.45 percent above the \$11 million that was allotted for 1954.

I wonder how anybody can feel that that is not a very liberal amount.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the members of the committee for the fine work they have done. The purpose of my having asked my distinguished colleague to yield is with reference to the statement of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], a moment ago. He mentioned that among other things special provision was made in this bill for Coolidge High School stadium. Is the amount the budget request, \$157,000?

Mr. NORRELL. That is in the bill as it has been written by the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. That is for plans, specifications, construction, and improvement of the stadium?

Mr. NORRELL. That is the way I understand it. If I am incorrect the chairman can correct me.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to compliment the committee for including this amount because for 14 years this stadium at the Coolidge High School has been neglected. The stadium has been deteriorating, going down; this would permit the improvement of the stadium in order that it may be utilized by the school.

There has been a great deal of interest as manifested by the fact that there is a group of high-school girls, including my daughter, Carolyn, from the Coolidge High School in the gallery. They are here because of the interest of the students. I am very glad that the school authorities, the District Commissioners, and this committee have after these years included this item in the budget and in this appropriation bill.

This improvement is badly needed. This will provide seats and other improvements to permit its utilization of this field for various events, including football games, cadet training, and so forth. I am in hopes that this improvement can be completed in time for its use this fall.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I think we have a very good bill here today. I am unhappy only with three of the fifty-odd items contained in the bill.

The first one is of course the slash of \$4 million in the Federal contribution; and, in this connection the press reported that I had tried to increase the Federal contribution allowed but that others wanted it cut even more, and that we compromised. I do not know where they got their information. I want to make

it clear that insofar as I was concerned there was no compromise. On the contrary I voted against the \$4 million cut, and announced to the subcommittee that I reserved the right to vote for a reinstatement of the cut if such a motion were made here today, and I shall do so.

Last year we admittedly did not give the various departments all they needed. We did not do so then because of the lack of funds. But notwithstanding that lack, we were careful to leave the District government a \$12 million working margin, or safety margin. The report for last year shows we provided for and anticipated a \$12 million surplus. We were not far off. The surplus at the end of this year as shown by the report will be \$11,499,671. Although there was that much surplus anticipated last year we still gave the District for that year the full authorized amount of Federal funds. We did not cut the Federal contribution.

But what do we do this year? We provide for an estimated overall surplus of only \$2,366,833. On a 168-odd million dollar budget that is no safety margin at all. And on top of that we cut the authorized Federal contribution by one-fifth. I am unable to understand this complete reversal of policy on the part of the committee.

The committee report says that to grant the full \$20 million authorized Federal contribution would only increase the surplus to \$6 million. Well, in the first place, that is only half of the surplus we thought was necessary last year as a margin of safety. The anticipated surplus last year on the general fund alone, according to last year's report, was \$3,764,282. The anticipated surplus in the general fund this year is not disclosed by the report, but I understand it will be only \$200,000, and that is no surplus at all on a \$168 million budget.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The point I wish to make to the gentleman is that the gentleman speaks of the \$2,300,000 figure as the overall; but in the general fund, which is the fund we must depend upon to meet emergencies at the end of the fiscal year, without any emergency there will be only about \$200,000.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is right, and let us not forget that this bill is different from other appropriation bills in that here we have to depend on taxes, and if the taxes do not pan out, with such a small working margin the Commissioners would find themselves in difficulty.

In the second place, to provide this so-called overall surplus of \$2,366,833, the District is by this bill required to borrow \$7,957,000 on which the District must pay interest, so that instead of a surplus there will be actually a deficit of \$5,590,167. And notwithstanding this situation the Federal contribution was reduced by \$4 million. Again I repeat that I do not understand this complete reversal of policy on the part of the committee.

In connection with the need for additional school teachers and the almost complete lack of an effective music program in our public schools, the question recurred again and again as to why the

city of Washington was different from other cities in the country in that respect. I said in the committee hearings:

I do not think that the city of Washington is any different from any other city. It does appreciate the fact that music is a necessity.

By the way there are several clerical errors in the unedited report of the hearings. I hope next year we will not be so rushed that we cannot have time to see the transcript before it is printed. I said:

There is a difference in another respect, however, and that is that we have in the city of Washington one of the biggest landowners who is a bad taxpayer.

And it is true. The Congress as assessor fixed the assessment in past years entirely too low to begin with, then the Congress as taxpayer welshed on that assessment and up until last year paid only a part of it. Fortunately this year the Congress acting as assessor did fix the assessment on a more reasonable basis, but once again this committee is recommending that the Congress, acting as taxpayer, renege on its tax bill to the extent of one-fifth of the assessment. I hope Congress will not go back on its contract and will, like the other taxpayers whose tax bills were increased, make good on its own share. That is the least we can expect if we are to keep faith with the people of Washington.

The second major item about which I am unhappy is the appropriation for Gallinger Hospital. Gallinger Hospital requested appropriations for 238 new positions. The commissioners reduced that request to 32 positions and reduced the requested increase to \$197,909. Of this requested increase, \$184,909 was disallowed. Of the number of positions disallowed, 14 had been authorized in previous appropriation bills but not filled because of lack of funds. There is nothing to indicate that this previous finding was wrong.

Nearly half of the total increase requested and disallowed was for maintenance and utility service amounting to \$91,369. Oral justifications before the committee were meager, but somewhat general statement of the details for that large item disallowed will be found at page 316. It includes a large amount of repairs, painting, and other upkeep requirements. Certainly it is not economy to let buildings crumble and deteriorate, particularly hospital buildings. Other requests by Gallinger Hospital, approved by the commissioners but disallowed by the committee, include dietary service \$22,470; housekeeping service \$30,200; laboratory service \$8,890; laundry service \$5,500; nursing education \$4,205; treatment service \$20,900; X-ray service \$3,175; outpatient clinics \$10,000; and postage \$1,200. The justifications indicate that \$748 more than was allowed had to be used for postage this year, and on the basis of that actual history the additional \$1,200 was requested. Certainly this item should not have been disallowed in toto.

The third item about which I am unhappy is the appropriation for the public schools. I have the utmost confidence in Dr. Corning, Superintendent of Schools, and in his Board of Education.

I also have the utmost confidence in the three Commissioners, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Camaller, and General Prentiss, and think the committee does, too. As shown by the hearings at page 23 the Board of Education requested 397 new teachers and 19 other positions, which were reduced to 192 and 3, respectively, by the city Commissioners, and the total amount requested by the Commissioners after such reduction was further reduced by our committee to the extent of \$168,430. With two excellent public boards screening these needs, it seems to me folly for our committee to say we know more than they do as to the needs of the public schools of this city.

Although I myself do not intend to offer amendments increasing these items, I sincerely hope that the Senate committee will go into both the public health appropriation and the public schools appropriation thoroughly and that they will recommend to the Senate and to us an adjustment more nearly in line with the recommendations of the Board of Education, which, by the way, were strongly supported by the citizens and taxpayers who appeared before us, or at least an adjustment more in line with the minimum recommendations made by the city Commissioners, which, on the face of it, seems to be a rather drastic cut from what the Board of Education recommended.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I just wanted the gentleman to clarify his statement that the committee had made a complete reversal of itself. Now, what committee did the gentleman refer to?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am referring to our subcommittee because last year, as I say, we were very careful to give them a working margin of \$12 million. This year, instead of giving them a working margin of \$12 million, we reduced the Federal contribution and gave them a working margin of only \$2 million plus, of which only \$200,000 is in the real working fund, the general fund. As I said awhile ago, this bill is different from other appropriation bills in that the District of Columbia has to depend on taxes to meet the contingencies and must have working capital or a safety margin to operate on so as not to find itself in trouble at the end of the year. We reversed ourselves in that this year we gave them hardly any safety margin, and we also reduced the appropriation from \$20 million to \$16 million, whereas last year, with \$12 million surplus, we gave them the full amount of the Federal contribution.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate and compliment the subcommittee on appropriations for what has been an extensive bill dealing with the expenditures of money for the District of Columbia. As chairman of the fiscal subcommittee which wrote the so-called public works bill, I should like to call attention to that recently passed law. We gave authority at law to con-

duct a thorough public works program in the District of Columbia, something that has been needed for a long time. It provided for schools, for hospitals, for sewers, for water construction, because there has accumulated a great backlog of need.

Mr. Chairman, as one of those who spent a great deal of time in working out that program, I want to say that the joint fiscal subcommittees of the House and the Senate rewrote that legislation after it was presented to us. After full and complete hearings we rewrote and imposed two things: One, an increase in the Federal contribution from \$11 million to \$20 million a year, and we imposed upon the taxpayers of the District of Columbia a considerable increase in their taxes to meet this obligation. I am sorry to be in disagreement with this subcommittee in cutting down the appropriation from \$20 million to \$16 million at the start of this program. I want to say that I am not saying that critical of the committee, but I think it is a mistake, because as you analyze it and as the Commissioners analyze the result of what the subcommittee has done, you are exposing the general fund for fiscal 1955, with no emergencies, mind you, with a possible balance of only \$200,000—just blindly assuming there will be no emergency. Nobody was happy to have to increase taxes on the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, but it was imperative. The Federal Government owns 42 and a fraction percent of all of the limited 10-mile area of the District of Columbia. I think the increase in the contribution from \$11 million to \$20 million was exceedingly reasonable. I do not think anyone complained about it. I was happy to hear the gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. WILSON], say that no one was complaining about the increase in the taxes. After we had come out with our bill we were criticized for increasing taxes upon the District of Columbia. I think they should bear some of the increase.

As the chairman said, this city belongs to the Nation. It does not belong merely to the people of the District of Columbia. I feel very much about home rule as the gentleman does. This city belongs to the people of the country. It also belongs to the people of the District of Columbia.

I think it is our duty to be as thoughtful and as considerate to the people of the District of Columbia, for whom we are charged to legislate, as we are when we vote for the Nation as a whole. I think we owe an equal responsibility to the people here.

When we reach that point in the bill, I shall offer an amendment to increase this contribution from \$16 million to \$20 million. I shall do that with all the justification in the world, because we are starting out on a long-range program. In this bill we are saying to them, "We do not trust you with a little surplus."

I want the committee to go over their justifications each year, and their program carefully, and see that they are sound. But I would not start out by cutting them down and leaving them

with practically nothing in their fund to run on.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I should like to say, Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], who was chairman of the subcommittee that handled the original authorization bill, that there was very little opposition, if any, when the bill passed the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I join with the previous speakers in paying my respects and compliments to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the very splendid work they have done on this bill and on the difficult and thankless job which anyone assumes in handling matters for the District of Columbia.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] who was chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia which handled this public-works bill. I have served with him on that committee. I think there ought to be an understanding on the part of the House of just what was done there.

It has been recognized for a long time that the capital of the Nation is deteriorating. I think most of us recognize the responsibility of the Federal Government in that matter. So a plan was devised for doing the necessary restoration of public works here in the District of Columbia. A joint subcommittee of both the Senate and the House worked on this plan for a period of 4 or 5 months. All through the winter we worked on this bill, and finally brought you in a bill which the House approved and which the Senate approved.

In that bill the committee did not do what the District Commissioners asked them to do. They made many revisions in the plan. The theory of the plan that was finally adopted was that this work ought to be done, that it ought to be shared partly by the taxpayers of the District and partly by the Federal Government. That was the scheme and that was the plan which was adopted.

When we did that we raised taxes on the citizens of the District of Columbia. We even did the very unusual thing of putting a sales tax on food in the District. We put a sales tax on groceries. None of us wanted to do that, but in order to carry out this program and to carry out what we regard as the proper division of this necessary appropriation, we spread those taxes on the people of the District of Columbia, on practically every element of the population here, and put the taxes on them to meet the obligation that we put on the Federal Government to do these necessary public works.

We brought it in here. The House passed it and the Senate passed it. I regarded it as a contract. I think we obligated ourselves to do this job, and we did it within the past month. Yet the first time an appropriation comes up we are hedging on it.

I wonder, if we are going to cut down on this part that the Federal Government is going to pay, if we ought not to go back and revise the taxes on the people of the District of Columbia; in other words, ought we not repeal this bill if we are not going to carry it out?

They may say it is not a contract. It may not be a binding contract; nevertheless it is the scheme that was proposed and worked out by the House and the Senate, and the scheme that was adopted. It cannot be carried out unless we do get the appropriation.

I do not think we ought to do this thing. I do not think we ought to make a plan like this and then the very first time an appropriation comes up repudiate it. I do not think it is the right thing to do. I am sure that if these members of the Appropriations Committee who bring in this cut had sat with the legislative committee through these hearings and worked out this scheme, I know those fellows, they just would not have done this thing if they had gone through the details of it as did we who sat on the committee.

I do hope the Members of the House will sustain our previous action and restore this cut.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As a member of the subcommittee, I want to say that I have always felt as the gentleman from Virginia feels, and I am supporting this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to be critical of anyone, but I want to call attention to the item for the Metropolitan Police. I notice that you are increasing the appropriation. I am not questioning the wisdom of that, for it is probably necessary, but I notice you are providing for additional motorcycle policemen.

I may be old fashioned in what I have to say, but within the last 4 years on 3 separate occasions my automobile has been broken into and over \$500 worth of property taken, and I never even got a report back from the Police Department. They have not been able to solve any of these robberies so far as I have been advised. I am alarmed at the extent of our juvenile delinquency and crime in the District of Columbia. I am not going to try to excuse the parents. I think a good bit of your juvenile-delinquency problem can be laid at the doorstep of the homes. But, I am of the opinion that if we took some of these Metropolitan policemen out of scout cars and off of motorcycle beats and put them on a fixed beat, and made them responsible for it in sections where these youngsters 12, 13, and 14 years of age could be rapped with a nightstick and told to get back home—today they are running at large over the city of Washington, and which is largely the reason why there is so much difficulty and so much juvenile delinquency and trouble—we

might get better results. As I see it, there is no sense maintaining a police department here to investigate crime after it is committed. What we want to do is to have a police department that will prevent crime in the first place, if possible, and the best way to do that is to put some of these policemen back on a fixed beat and make them responsible for it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I concur with what the gentleman has said. There is no argument about that, but I do want to explain what the eight motorcycle policemen are for. They are for the purpose of checking the parking-meter violations and, of course, when they get down to the central system, violators can mail their checks in. This is purely for the purpose of checking parking violations.

Mr. BAILEY. No doubt they are necessary.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. A motorcycle man will ride along and see a red meter where a car is overparked and will put a ticket on it and go on his way. Then the person will mail his check in and pay his fine.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not want anyone to get the impression that I am criticizing the members of the Metropolitan Police force. On the whole, they are doing a fair job. I think if there is any criticism, it is to be leveled against those who are managing the Police Department in that they are not getting down to the local community and having law enforcement where it belongs.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me his time?

Mr. NORRELL. Yes, sir; I yield the time remaining on this side to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I simply want to ask a question, and perhaps get some explanation. I notice in the committee's report under the item, Department of Public Welfare, there has been an item for emergency homemaking services deleted. This service, I understand, will provide assistance in the homes for mothers who are ill or who have to be absent for some other emergency reason. The committee says it has taken this item out because this work can be done by the Visiting Nurses Association and that the commissioners are instructed to make available \$50,000 to them. It is my understanding that this Visiting Nurses Association cannot and does not supply this service. I also would like to know from what fund this \$50,000 is going to be appropriated to the organization, if it does do the work. There are two questions there.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The money, of course, comes from the general appropriation for the Public Health Depart-

ment. The testimony we heard before the committee in behalf of what this Visiting Nurses Association is doing was very good, and the position we took is—why should we set up a \$45,000 organization to administer a \$50,000 appropriation. In other words, we already have an organization that is administering the very service which we, as a committee, want to further and to continue. Therefore, that is where we thought we would direct the money rather than setting up a new organization.

Mr. HYDE. It seems to me that there might have been a misunderstanding because the service which this money is supposed to be provided for is not nursing. It is a sort of baby-sitting service, as I understand it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. That is exactly what was testified to before our committee and what they asked for. They say here is a situation where here is a woman who is sick in the home with children, and her husband cannot go to work, we have to have somebody sit there and take care of that lady and her children so that the husband can go to work. Otherwise, we will have the whole family on public welfare. That is what the money was asked for and instead of giving it to them, we give it to the Visiting Nurses Service doing exactly that sort of thing.

Mr. HYDE. It is my understanding that is not the work that the Visiting Nurses Association does.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The money you are talking about in this bill is exactly for the purpose I told you it is for. That is what they asked for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-four Members are present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82]

Abbitt	Coudert	Granahan
Adair	Cretella	Green
Addonizio	Crosser	Gwinn
Albert	Curtis, Nebr.	Hand
Ayres	Dague	Harrison, Va.
Barrett	Davis, Ga.	Harrison, Wyo.
Becker	Dawson, Ill.	Hays, Ark.
Bentley	Dawson, Utah	Hays, Ohio
Bentzen	Delaney	Heller
Boland	Dingell	Hess
Bolling	Dodd	Hillings
Bolton	Dollinger	Hoffman, Mich.
Frances P.	Dolliver	Holt
Bosch	Donohue	Holtzman
Boykin	Doyle	Howell
Brooks, La.	Durham	Hruska
Buckley	Evins	Jackson
Burdick	Feighan	Jarman
Busbey	Fine	Javits
Byrne, Pa.	Fino	Jonas, Ill.
Camp	Fogarty	Kean
Cannon	Fountain	Keogh
Celler	Frazier	Kersten, Wis.
Chatham	Frelinghuysen	Kilburn
Chudoff	Friedel	King, Pa.
Clardy	Fulton	Kluczynski
Cole, N. Y.	Gamble	Krueger
Condon	Gathings	Lane
Corbett	Golden	Latham
Cotton	Gordon	Lesinski

Lucas	Patten	Springer
McConnell	Patterson	Stauffer
McCulloch	Perkins	Stringfellow
Machrowicz	Philbin	Sutton
Mack, Ill.	Pilcher	Taylor
Madden	Powell	Teague
Magnuson	Prouty	Thompson, La.
Meader	Reece, Tenn.	Velde
Morrow	Reed, Ill.	Wainwright
Miller, Nebr.	Riley	Warburton
Miller, N. Y.	Rivers	Welch
Morano	Rodino	Wharton
Morgan	Rooney	Wheeler
Morrison	Roosevelt	Wickersham
Multer	Sadlak	Widnall
Oakman	Scott	Williams, Miss.
O'Konski	Sheehan	Willis
O'Neill	Sheeley	Wilson, Tex.
Osmer	Sheppard	Wolcott
Ostertag	Sieminski	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HALLECK] having resumed the chair, Mr. MCGREGOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9517) and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 286 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Before we consider amendments, are there any points of order? The Chair hears none.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: On page 2, line 4, strike out "\$16,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000"; and on page 2, line 7, strike out "\$5,500,000" and insert "\$7,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the amendments I have just offered are to change the appropriation from \$16 million to \$20 million, and if that increase is made, the second amendment would merely earmark for capital improvements the greater amount as increased by the increase in the appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I would not have asked for this additional time but I know that many Members were not on the floor when the matter was under discussion

in general debate, and I thought I should like to explain the reason for the increase.

I think I have probably been as conservative a Member of the House in the matter of appropriations as any Member, but I do consider it a wise economy in a program as important as our public works program that we provide adequately for the long-range capital improvement program and the contributions which are to be made by the Federal Government as well as the imposition of these increased taxes upon the citizens of the District. We should not only deal wisely in laying out the program we have so recently adopted but we should start in the first appropriation and live up to our part of the agreement as the legislative body for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is a political matter. Some may treat it so, but let me tell you that the President in his opening message referred to the need for a long-range program of public works in the District of Columbia. He referred to it in very strong language, if you would care to look it up. Also, the Bureau of the Budget recommended that great attention be paid to that program. I think, even without that, those of us who live within the District of Columbia take pride in it as our Nation's Capital and the place where we spend most of our time and where some have spent a great part of their lives and some may end their life span here; we all want to treat it as fairly and as decently as we would any other part of the country. I say to you that the one disagreement I have with my colleagues of the District of Columbia Committee on Appropriations has been in reducing this down to an absolute minimum instead of allowing at the very start of the program the necessary appropriation to begin with. This is a long-range program. The Commissioners, in whom I have the greatest confidence, have just had this program, the skeleton or rough outline of it, adopted. They start out with all of these tremendous needs for the District of Columbia. The program has to be laid out properly and approved by the District of Columbia Committee on Appropriations each year, and that is only proper. Why make a great ado about reducing this from \$20 million to \$16 million? If it is not expended, as the report of this subcommittee shows, it will be subject to reappropriation and reconsideration in this following year.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. May I first of all commend the gentleman for the work his committee did in working out this program. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Did not your committee meet jointly with a committee of the other body?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It did.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. And did you go into all phases of this program?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. We did.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. And did your committee carefully weigh the request of the Commissioners?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Indeed, they did.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. And did they cut down the request in various instances?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Let me say to my colleague, we completely changed their approach to it, which would have been a greater borrowing and a greater contribution on the part of the Federal Government, and less contribution on the part of the District of Columbia. By our action, we completely rewrote the program so as to levy a heavier tax upon the District of Columbia, and then, on top of that, to nail it down in a legislative outline, the earmarking that had to be made each year to capital outlay.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I think the point ought to be thoroughly considered by the House and by this Committee that the residents of the District of Columbia in accepting this program through their Commissioners have to pay very much larger taxes and bear an increased burden, and that the Federal Government is certainly encroaching more and more on the District. I believe it is a false economy, and if I may say so, hardly fair to cut down this amount.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to ask a very straight and very serious question. Does the gentleman as a member of the House District Committee and a member of the joint committee of the House and Senate, which met to discuss this problem, feel that this committee of yours made a commitment to the people of the District of Columbia and to the officials of the District that the Congress would do certain things?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I certainly feel, may I say to my colleague, that we did make a commitment. We not only committed them to pay more taxes, but we committed our Government to contribute proportionately, as we laid out that program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And do you feel as a legislative representative of the Congress that your committee on the part of the House committed the House to certain action on this matter?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I will certainly—

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit me to answer my colleague, and then I will be glad to yield?

I feel this way about it: We committed this Congress to a long-range program. We committed the District of Columbia and the taxpayers to a long-range program. I feel that we in the Congress are reneging on our commitment when we reduce the amount which we said should be contributed at the very start of this program.

Let me say to my colleagues I fully appreciate that it is the responsibility and should be the responsibility of the Appropriations Committee to look that

program over and to have it justified each and every year, but I do say to you not this year. Do not start out by saying we are going to renege right now at the start of this program. Next year if their program is not developed and they did not need this money or they have not used what has been appropriated, that is another story.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, if he desires me to yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The gentleman from Minnesota, as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] know full well that this House has no authority to commit the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate any amount of money. We have not become subservient to any other committee. We still have our responsibility to the people. I dislike very much to hear the gentleman say that he as an individual or as a member of a committee, committed the Appropriations Committee to appropriate a certain sum of money, because you cannot do it and you know you cannot do it. You have no moral or legal right to do it.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Let me say in an equally mild way to my colleague, if the Appropriations Committee makes a mistake then the House has the responsibility of correcting it. That is why I am here on the floor today, and I very seldom take up your time, but I disagree heartily with the District of Columbia Appropriations Committee which says they know more about it than anybody else. I feel they have equal ability with any other committee, but the final determination is for the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota was granted 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, let me urge you—and I hope I shall not use the 3 minutes that I have asked for—let me urge you, if you share with those of us who have worked so long on this program, our view—and I want to say to you that I never worked with a harder working committee than the Fiscal Affairs Committee, my colleagues on my side of the aisle and certainly my colleagues, Judge SMITH, from Virginia, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], worked long days and weeks on this matter. We approached it purely on the problem of the responsibility that is chargeable to us in the Congress to legislate for our Nation's Capital, to do what was right. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, in urging support of my amendment, let us not start out such a program, a program that had the endorsement of the President of the United States, that had the endorsement of both the Senate and the House; let us not start out by turning down at the very start the important laying out of that program. I urge you to put back in the amount which was laid out in the civil-works program, and which passed this House so recently.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The Congress also committed the District Government to borrow almost \$8 million a year for this long-range program.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is right.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. And this committee also in this bill is requiring them to live up to that commitment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is right.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Along with the commitment that they pay additional taxes. I agree with the gentleman that we should require the Federal Government to live up to its commitment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. In conclusion, so you will understand what you are doing, this is the amount that goes into the general fund on the basis of your cutting it down to \$16 million, as the gentleman from New Mexico said in general debate; and it is true: You will have a surplus at the end of the fiscal year 1955 of possibly \$200,000. Just imagine what that is in a budget of \$168 million. Just one little emergency and you would have a bankrupt general fund in the District of Columbia.

I do not often ask my colleagues in the House, but this time I beg them to correct the mistake of the Appropriations Committee on this matter and restore it to the full \$20 million.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment for several reasons, the first of which is that in my opinion there is now pending before the District Legislative Committee a bill that I introduced about 2 months ago that would provide ample revenue for this District not only to meet its operating expenses, but also to finance the public-works program. I favor that public-works program.

The bill that I have reference to provides for the District of Columbia to operate a whisky retail monopoly system here in the District of Columbia. I do not know if I will ever get a hearing on that bill. I have asked the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee for hearings, but to date there has been none. My office is full of resolutions and letters from men and women who live in the District, from citizens' groups in this District saying that they favor the bill and would like to have an opportunity to testify in behalf of the bill.

I have figures from the Library of Congress showing that if that bill became law the revenue to the District would be between \$15 million and \$20 million a year.

Sixteen States now operate monopoly whisky store systems in America today, and those 16 States are making over \$200 million profit. If they can do it in Virginia, pay bills and carry on their public-works program, if they can do it in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Alabama, and the others of the 16 States, why can they not do it here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I think the gentleman may have a good point there, but

until his bill does pass I hope the gentleman will not punish the District of Columbia for the shortcomings of the Congress, and I hope the gentleman in thinking it over will go along with us and vote for this.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not know how long it takes a bill to become a law. I introduced it the same week they announced they needed a public-works program, and it is somewhere beyond my control. I would like to hear from the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any member of the District Committee present, as to what disposition has been made of my bill and what the plans are for bringing it to the floor of the House.

I have had enough Members of Congress tell me, I believe, that they would vote for the bill that if it came out here it would become law.

Remember, now, there is a bill pending in the District Committee which will bring into this District between \$15 million and \$20 million a year in revenue. Then all the financial worries of the District will be at an end if they will bring that bill before this Congress, for I am sure it will pass.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows his meritorious bill is not going to get any consideration unless pressure is put on through just some such means as this.

Mr. ANDREWS. If they need money and we give them a good painless way to raise the money why should we make the taxpayers of America put up \$14 million?

Mr. GROSS. We certainly should not, but as long as we give them the money through this process we will never hear from the gentleman's bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is that simple. My State of Alabama could not operate without the revenue derived from a whisky monopoly.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, maybe if the gentleman will go along with the District of Columbia Committee with what we have done and with what we are trying to do in this bill some will go along with the gentleman on his bill. Let me say to the gentleman that if some people would try this business of using a little honey instead of vinegar they might get further. But I introduced a bill such as this 20 years ago when the 18th amendment was repealed. I could not get anywhere with it. I think the gentleman's bill ought to have hearings and prompt hearings.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the gentleman say he cannot get a bill like that passed in 20 years?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In 20 years, but I have seen a lot of good bills that did not pass in 20 years. I am ready to help the gentleman but I wish he would help us.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to help the District and I think I have a better way

to help the District than through this amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a most appropriate time to start looking at or to reconsider this matter of the Federal Government's contribution to the District of Columbia. I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that in 1902, 52 years ago, the Federal Government contributed \$9,192,000 plus to the District of Columbia. That, Mr. Chairman, was 52 years ago. Last year the Federal Government contributed \$11 million. When you consider how much every other kind of contribution, whether it be from a Government agency or out of your own pocket for your own household, has increased in that length of time I think it is a fair statement to say that we have probably decreased in 52 years the amount of money that we contribute to the District of Columbia by some 70 or 80 percent. Percentage-wise the contribution at that time was 40 percent; last year percentage-wise the contribution was 8½ percent. If we pass this bill providing for \$20 million, it would only be about 11.9 percent.

Mr. Chairman, just contemplate for a moment those figures of 52 years ago. I am going to repeat them for emphasis. Fifty-two years ago we contributed to the District \$9,192,000 plus. Last year we contributed only \$2 million more than that.

When you consider what has taken place in the District of Columbia, when you consider the difference in the cost of upkeep from growth alone, to say nothing of the difference in the value of the dollar, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress ought to be ashamed to quibble here today about contributing \$20 million, particularly when you compare that with the contribution that the Federal Government made 52 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, there should be no question but what the Federal Government should contribute not just \$20 million but more than that. We should be here debating an amendment to increase it above \$20 million, not debating an amendment to prevent a cut of \$4 million.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the House should overwhelmingly support a vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman very kindly told us what the Federal contribution was 52 years ago. Well, I was not around here then, but I recall that some 20 years ago we contributed around \$5 million or less; so, I do not think we could use what was done 52 years ago as a precedent for what we should do today. We might go back to the 20-year period and cut it back to \$5 million.

Mr. HYDE. I think Congress should be ashamed of that \$5 million.

Mr. COLMER. Well, of course, that is what makes horse races.

Mr. HYDE. Yes. The gentleman is familiar with the cartoon called "Viewpoint"?

Mr. COLMER. Yes, I am familiar with it, and I just wonder whether the gentleman is familiar with it.

Mr. HYDE. Yes; very.

Mr. COLMER. Now, why should we, representing the various States, supplement and subsidize the District of Columbia to the extent of \$20 million when there is not a town in the gentleman's district nor in the district of most any Member on this floor that would not give a substantial amount, up into the millions of dollars, to have some of these Federal activities in their districts.

Mr. HYDE. Yes, and when they do that, whenever the Federal activities move into their districts, they are forced to come back to the Congress for bills such as the Federal impact aid bills because of the problems created by the installations. And, I think probably the gentleman voted for that bill.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman did, but not to the tune of any \$20 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I am going to request something that I have not asked for this year. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think we should review this situation. And, that is just what the committee thought. We should know what we are facing and what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, last year the appropriation for Federal contribution was \$11 million, and that was 7.16 percent of the total budget. This year, with \$16 million, it is 9.44 percent. But, with the additional amount running it up to \$20 million it is 12 percent of the budget; an increase away out of sight.

Now, on top of that, what is this increase for? How is it spread? It is not an increase just for capital expenditures, because there is an increase of \$2 million in the amount of direct contributions to operating expenses; in other words, with the amendment before you, you are approaching a raise from \$11 million to \$13 million in the operating expense contribution. Maybe we ought not to consider anything of that kind in the Committee on Appropriations. Maybe it is not our duty to see whether or not what is put up to us is right and fair and just.

Let us take a broad view of this whole situation. The District of Columbia is provided with enormous employment of Government personnel, running into millions and millions of dollars. They are provided with better jobs than industry provides, and yet their tax rate for 1954 is \$2.15 a hundred or \$21.50 a thousand; and for 1955, if this item is approved, it will be \$2.20 a hundred or \$22 a thousand, as the bill now stands. That is not a big increase. In my town the taxes run \$44, \$45, \$46 a thousand and the assessments there are on a higher basis than the assessments in the District of Columbia.

Is it fair that we should approach this problem with the idea that we are estab-

lishing a liability on the Federal Government to go out into every place where the Government has any activity and set up a Federal contribution for every single one of them? If the House goes along with this scheme, you cannot come to any other conclusion.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman is failing to take into consideration the fact that there are some other fringe obligations besides the direct levy against real estate. For instance, in the proposal in this budget, there is a 50 percent increase in the payment for water service.

Mr. TABER. We were not paying enough to cover the expense before.

Mr. BAILEY. The Government here consumes more water than all the individuals in the city of Washington together, and that water is furnished free by the District government.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no, it is not. It used to be, but it is not now and it has not been for several years. There was \$1 million paid last year and the year before and the year before that. This year there is \$1,330,000 carried in the bill for that purpose.

Mr. BAILEY. That is a part of the \$20 million?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; it is not. The whole picture is this: Are we going to go back on our responsibilities? There is some responsibility that is supposed to attach to the job of being a Member of Congress. Are we going to meet our responsibilities? Frankly, for my own part, I was not in favor of increasing the Federal contribution. I have gone along with the \$16-million figure, but I could not go along with a dollar more. I think \$16 million is ridiculous; it is too big a figure. The people in the District ought to be very happy that the Congress is prepared to give them \$16 million. Frankly, there are too many things crowding up on the Government all the time. We have got to have a sense of responsibility to face this situation squarely. These people are not hurt; in fact, they are helped by the Government being here. We should not make a contribution that is away out of sight, away out of proportion. The fact that the legislative committee has determined that that should be done does not mean that it has studied it any harder than those on the Appropriations Committee have done. It does not mean that there is any more merit in it just because they arrived at a conclusion different from what we arrived at in the Appropriations Committee. But if we are going to get anywhere with this country of ours we must meet our sense of responsibility to the people, to see that appropriations are kept down within bounds and that the taxes of the country are not raised way out of sight. We have enough to face at this time. Let us not add more to it by piling up dollar after dollar on these appropriation bills as they come before us.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. May I ask the chairman of the Appropriations

Committee, if the \$16 million prevails here today and proves inadequate, would he approve an additional amount for next year?

Mr. TABER. I do not know what I would do for next year. It would depend on what it looked like.

I want to tell you one thing I have neglected to state. The gentleman from Minnesota has said here that they would be out of money, that they had no margin left. Let me say to you that the margin is just the same as it was when the budget came in here. The items of appropriation were cut \$4 million almost to the penny, and the reduction in the contribution is \$4 million. You would not have raised that question that you were going to be out of money if the cut in the contribution had not been announced.

Here is the picture: You are facing just the same situation that you did when the budget was presented. No kick was made at that time.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is the very reason why some of us went along with the cut, so as not to leave too narrow a margin in addition to making the cuts you took away from us.

Mr. TABER. There were some of us that felt some responsibility not to allow more for the items for the District of Columbia than it required to get them along in decent shape. We were told when they brought in that reorganization bill a year ago that they were going to reduce expenses as the result of it. The result has been that they have increased expenses tremendously, and they came in here with a budget that called for a lot more personnel than were needed. The committee cut them down and got them down nearer to where they belonged.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] to restore this appropriation. I do it with a great deal of reluctance, after the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has made his appeal to you to maintain this cut. I do it because I have a deep affection for him and a great respect for his knowledge of the fiscal affairs of this Nation. I have followed him so long that it goes against the grain for me to get up here and oppose what he is trying to do in the way of cutting this appropriation. I would not do it except for my belief in the eternal rightness of what we are doing.

I must review the situation again because there has been some rather loose talk here about who committed whom to what. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] did not commit anybody to anything. I served on the fiscal affairs subcommittee of the District with the Joint Committee, together with the Senate and that committee did not commit the Congress to anything. But we came back here to the House with a bill which we worked out and the Congress

passed that bill—we did not pass it. You Members who are called upon today to vote to repudiate this program are the people who committed yourselves to carry it through less than a month ago. It went over to the other body and that body committed you to the payment of this program. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about what goes on in the District of Columbia, and we often overlook the fact that this is the Nation's Capital. You can step out into the corridor right now and I will bet that you will see thousands of constituents of ours, of all of us, who have come here to visit their Nation's Capital, a thing which we all have a pride in. Yet, the capital improvements in this city have deteriorated and deteriorated year after year until it is rapidly becoming a city that you will not be proud of any more. What the Congress did a month ago was to adopt a program to bring this city up to what it ought to be, and to require the taxpayers of the District of Columbia to pay a part of it, and the Federal Government to pay a part of it. What you are asked to do today is to repudiate your commitment that the Government would pay a part of it, and yet not repudiate your charge, which you have put upon the taxpayers of the District of Columbia. You can cut out this \$4 million, but you do not cut out the \$4 million you taxed the people of the District on their food and groceries. They have to pay that anyway—that is just not a fair deal and I do not think my friend, the gentleman from New York, realizes the full depth of this program and what was done about it and why the things that were done were done because, if he did, I do not believe he would take the position that he does. This Congress made a commitment to make the District of Columbia citizens pay a certain amount of tax and to make the Federal Government make a certain amount of contribution to meet it. You are asked to repudiate the Government's obligation, but still maintain the tax you have imposed upon the people of the District of Columbia. If you think that is right, then vote down this amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish briefly and with respect for all the speakers in disagreement to call attention to one phase of the subject under discussion.

Some weeks ago we passed the District public works bill which later was signed by the President and is now the law of the land. It is not within the power of the Appropriations Committee to change the provisions of that measure as they fix the contribution to the cost of the public-works program of people who pay a sales tax on 50 cent meals, on the groceries they buy, and on the beds occupied by visitors to Washington, including the delegations of schoolchildren.

The Appropriation Committee can say, provided the vote of the House supports the committee, that the United States Government can renege to the extent of \$4 million, but it cannot give one cent of relief to the little people who are bound by the law we passed to pay a sales tax on necessities. The only way relief can

be given them is by repeal of the public works act, and no one is suggesting that.

Whether it was a wise setup or not, the distribution of the cost of a long-needed program of public works for the 10 square miles that constitute the District of Columbia, is not now under consideration. I agree with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that the real-estate tax well might be higher. But the Congress passed upon that when the public works bill was being considered. I in my humble way sought to dissuade the House from approval of a sales tax on groceries and of 50 cents to \$1.25 meals. People who are forced to hunt out 50-cent dinners to keep within their budgets certainly should not have this sales-tax burden strapped to backs already excessively laden.

Nor should the little people of America who come to the Capital of their country, as pilgrims to a shrine, be forced to pay a tax on the beds they occupy when they visit here. Most of them are people of modest incomes, and the money they pay for the privilege and inspiration of coming to the shrine and capital of their country has to be most carefully applied. The public-works bill increased the tax on transient lodgings from 2 to 3 percent in order to raise an additional \$200,000 a year for the public-works program. I think it unfair and cruel. I fought it on the floor and lost.

As I have remarked, I plead with my colleagues, I am afraid all too inadequately, but with a very deep sincerity, not to put this unfair sales tax on the little people, the people least able to bear it. Despite the fact that our efforts to eliminate the sales tax on groceries, 50-cent dinners, and transient lodging failed, I voted for the final passage of the public-works bill. I voted for the bill because the public works contemplated were badly needed; they would contribute to the health and welfare and contentment of the residents of the District. Moreover, with unemployment growing, now is the time to proceed with needed public works.

It was my understanding at the time, it was the understanding of every Member of this House and of the other body, that the contribution of the Federal Government was to be \$20 million.

That was the deal. That was one of the terms of the bargain. It is avoiding the question to argue that the Appropriations Committee was not consulted. When the Congress of the United States decides the manner of the distribution of money to be raised from several sources and assumes for the Federal Government a certain fair and definite portion of the total I cannot concede that the Appropriations Committee has any honorable alternative than to appropriate the full amount necessary to meet the Government's obligation under the agreement approved by the Congress.

In a very large sense, the public works act may be regarded as being in the nature of a contract. The little people who pay the unfair sales tax are parties, involuntary parties, but nevertheless parties to the contract. They cannot be released by anything short of an outright repeal. The Federal Government likewise is a party, a voluntary party if you please, to the contract. It cannot be

released morally. I know of no rule of law or of equity by which it could be released if this were a private negotiation or were in the realm of contract ordinances usual in municipal government.

The proposal of the committee is to avoid the Federal Government's full compliance with the terms of the contract, to which the Congress has committed it, by the simple device of refusing to appropriate the money. Just one question, Mr. Chairman, may suggest the answer to that proposal. Suppose the little people should seek to avoid their part of the contract, the payment of an unfair sales tax on groceries and inexpensive meals and beds, on the grounds that their wives refused to make the necessary appropriations, or allowances, from family budgets; what then?

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this amendment. I trust that this House by an overwhelming majority for the pending amendment will show fidelity to the principles of honesty and square dealing on the part of our Government as well as of the people whose Government it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is after my 5 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Is there any reason why his 5 minutes cannot be included in the request?

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the last 5 minutes be reserved for myself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Chair had recognized me.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Did the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yielded for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close within 10 minutes after the gentleman from Massachusetts finishes speaking, with the last 5 minutes being reserved for the chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair again recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there are certain established facts in connection with this matter that I think are rather compelling upon my mind and should also be compelling upon the minds of members of this committee. It was only a few months ago that we passed a bill relating to the District of Columbia in which we pledged the Federal Government to contribute \$20 million to the District of Columbia, and

that that money in part was to carry out what we considered to be a necessary program in relation to the District and to the city of Washington. I recognize the force of the argument that authorizations are not binding upon the Committee on Appropriations or upon either branch of the Congress. Where, for example, an authorization is contained in a bill for an appropriation of \$20 million for a project, a lesser amount might be appropriated, particularly where the project is one that will continue for several years, but having in mind that the full amount would be appropriated over the period of time necessary to construct the particular project, such as a dam, by way of illustration. But I consider this authorization to be entirely different. When I voted for the bill which passed this House several months ago, of which the Public Works provision was a part, I considered that I was morally obligated to vote to appropriate \$20 million each year, necessary to carry out the parts of the Public Works program contained in the bill at that time. So I think that fact is established. We have an additional fact established, that President Eisenhower in his budget message recommended it to the Congress of the United States. I have profound respect for the views of President Eisenhower, or any other President; and I might say to my friends that that is also a very potent factor that I cannot ignore, because President Eisenhower apparently recognized that at least there was a moral, if not a legal obligation involved. In that respect I am glad to note that the President's views are in agreement with my own.

I might also say that despite the unwise and the intemperate remarks made on two occasions by Mr. Shanley—and I say this in no unkind way about Mr. Shanley—I repeat, despite the unwise and intemperate remarks made on two occasions by Mr. Shanley who is the personal attorney for President Eisenhower, in relation to the Democrats in Congress, I am still going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], to increase the appropriation to the amount that I voted for in the bill that passed the Congress several months ago.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I wish to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that this is part of the dynamic program.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not quite catch the question.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I say I would like to ask the gentleman if this is not part of the President's dynamic program.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we preceded the President, did we not? Your committee considered this bill. Is that right?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. The joint committee and the subcommittee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and the President's recommendation in the budget for \$20 million is carrying out what your committee recommended be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. And I may add that it passed the committee unanimously.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly; so it follows this dynamic action was on the part of your committee and on the part of the Congress. I repeat therefore that despite the unwise and intemperate remarks made on two occasions by Mr. Shanley, the personal attorney for President Eisenhower, I am going to vote for this amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

I might say for Mr. Shanley's benefit, however, that only the other day we voted to pass for 1 year the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I think, if Mr. Shanley will look at the rollcall, he will find that many more Democrats voted for the extension than Republicans; he will probably find that of the 53 or 54 Members who voted against the extension for a limited period of 1 year, that 47 or 48 were Republicans, and only 5 or 6 Democrats voted against the extension.

And I would also call Mr. Shanley's attention to the fact that every one of the bills we Democrats voted for are good Democratic measures of the past 20 years, and we are glad to welcome President Eisenhower to our ranks.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we on the Appropriations Committee always have a difficult and sometimes unwelcome task to try and hold down appropriations. This is one time that it is unwelcome. But I do want to call to the attention of the Committee that this bill brought in by Mr. WILSON and his subcommittee has already increased the gift from the other taxpayers of the United States of America to the District of Columbia by \$5 million above this year. That surely is being very liberal with the District. Yet there are those who feel that we should add another \$4 million to this appropriation. I am sure that Mr. O'HARA is sincere in his desire to treat the District and its people fairly. He has always been very fair. I think this is one place in which he is being too liberal, however.

I could never see the justification for raising this lump-sum authorization, by the new law, to \$20 million. I think even the \$16 million in this appropriation bill is too much. I cannot see the justification for even that much as long as the District of Columbia does not raise its real-estate tax rate at least up to the average of the tax rates in the 48 States.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will yield later if I have time. Please excuse me now, Mr. SIMPSON.

No, not as long as the tax rate on real estate does not even average up—average up, mind you—with the other 48 States of the Union. The District of Columbia is now third or fourth on the list as far as having the lowest tax rate in the United States is concerned. Why should we people back in southwestern Minnesota, who have our own taxes to pay, help the 800,000 residents of the District of Columbia pay their taxes

when they perhaps are in far better financial condition than we? Consider for a minute the tremendous cash payroll, paid by our Federal Government, which provides a great business impetus in this region. We would like to have just one small bureau located in my Seventh District and I assure you that my people would welcome one small segment without asking for a Federal contribution in return. Is it not just ordinary common sense that we give some consideration, regardless of our regard for this place we live in part of the year, to the entire fiscal picture of this great Nation of ours? This \$16 million proposed here as a gift is all going to be borrowed money. Not a dime of it can come out of the reserves in the Treasury. There are no reserves. We are going into the hole this year, yet some would add to that deficit nationwide by being overly liberal to the District, by giving them more than this generous treatment that Mr. WILSON's subcommittee has given by adding an additional \$5 million above last year. Do you not think we must use some good common sense if this Congress is going to hope to ever balance the budget of the United States of America? What good does it do the school children in this city to give them this additional grant, if we continue deficit financing and make it probable perhaps in 20 or 30 years for good old Uncle Sam to renege on his outstanding bonds? Is it not more important to these children to tighten up fiscally here today so that their future can be secure?

Keep in mind our \$275 billion national debt and down in your innermost soul I believe you will agree that perhaps here is a place we can refuse to add \$4 million to that same indebtedness by not letting our feelings run away with us. Yes, we on Appropriations must become hardboiled at times, even though like the rest of you we would like to be more generous than we can afford.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan. He has always been careful in voting the expenditure of our taxpayers' money. I wish there were more like him in the House.

Mr. SHAFER. If the gentleman does not mind, I think it would be a good idea to put in the RECORD back a few paragraphs previously in your speech that not only do they have the lowest tax rates or among the lowest tax rates of any city in the country but they get the highest rentals also.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes. The hotel rates here are shocking to the average American who comes here for a few days. We should decentralize this huge Government. That would help a lot. There are some properties in the District that have not had a reassessment for tax purposes for a good many years. That information has been given to me by an attorney who has worked upon this very subject. Surely, if the District of Columbia legislative committee would look into these properties in the District, they could find ample taxable properties from which to get this \$4 million without mulcting the taxpayers of the Nation as

a whole. I sincerely hope the amendment of my good friend, Mr. O'HARA, will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, when the subcommittee got through marking up this bill we found that we had cut \$3,988,708 in the bill; in other words, we lacked approximately \$11,000 of trimming the complete \$4 million from it.

The budget carried along with it a surplus of \$2,460,000. So by taking this \$4 million off we still would have left them the same surplus as they have anticipated. According to all reasonable bases of reasoning, they will have approximately \$12 million surplus at the end of this year.

Here is the history of their surpluses: In 1949 the budget estimated they would have a surplus of \$17,417. They wound up with a surplus of \$1,250,000. In 1950 they estimated their surplus at \$1,900,000 and they wound up with \$10 million. In 1951 they estimated their surplus at \$1,700,000 and they wound up with \$15 million. In 1952 they estimated their surplus at \$2,600,000 and they wound up with \$11 million. In 1953 they estimated their surplus at \$15,000 and they wound up with \$14 million. They have been running around \$12 million more in their surpluses than they have estimated.

It is only logical to believe that in the initiation of this program they will fall short in expenditures and they may wind up with \$20 million surplus. Anyway, it will probably be \$12 million even though the \$4 million is cut.

My only argument to cut the \$4 million is it just saves appropriating money and paying interest on money that is not going to be used. There is nothing in the law that says that the \$200 million contribution by the Federal Government over a 10-year period should be allocated \$20 million a year, and there is no reason in this world to believe that they could use a full quota the first year. It is going to take time to plan this program and put it into operation, and I think they could much more wisely spend more money later on. I am not trying to welsh upon it at all. I feel like this, that the money will lie idle in the Treasury, will not be used. As chairman of the subcommittee, I am willing to give them their full share, but I do not like to see surpluses pile up on which the Federal Government must pay interest. Therefore, in order to prevent the piling up of surpluses and paying interest on the money, I feel that we should go along with the committee's recommendation of \$16 million, and next year we will take another look and see what they need. And, if they need \$24 million to carry on the program, I, as a member of the committee, am willing to go along.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 57, noes 54.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WILSON of Indiana and Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 70, noes 59.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 4, line 1, strike out "\$258,215" and insert "\$283,215 of which \$25,000 shall be available for expenditure by the American Legion Convention 1954 Corporation in connection with the 1954 National Convention of the American Legion, subject to reimbursement from the American Legion if receipts exceed expenses."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment inasmuch as the proposed expenditure is not authorized by law and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] was on his feet. Does the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. NORRELL. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to argue that this amendment is not subject to a point of order unless it is that the point of order comes too late. I had understood when we agreed on a time limitation and also agreed that the bill be considered as read, that all points of order on amendments at the Clerk's desk were waived. With that in mind the Chairman can say whether or not I am correct.

Mr. Chairman, if you adopt this amendment, the only thing you do is this—

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. NORRELL. The gentleman reserved his point of order, did he not?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I made a point of order and press my point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] is entitled to be heard on the point of order made against his amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas is arguing on the merits of the amendment and not as to the point of order itself. I shall reserve the point of order if the gentleman wishes to argue the merits, but I should like it clearly understood that I am not withdrawing my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make inquiry of the gentleman from Arkansas if he can furnish the Chair with an authorization covering the language in his amendment.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I frankly say there is no authorization in law covering this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for the continuation of his objection to the point of order.

Mr. NORRELL. I have never claimed that there was an authorization for this item. I do not so claim now. But if this amendment should be adopted you will only permit the District Commissioners to carry out the pledge they made to the American Legion Convention last year when it was in session. They went to the convention and asked that the 1954 convention be held here in Washington. As an inducement to get the convention, they agreed that if the convention committee decided to come here and hold the 1954 American Legion Convention in Washington they would try to get the Congress to appropriate \$25,000 to be used for expenses, with the understanding written into law that the money would be refunded out of proceeds of the Legion Convention after the Legion had adjourned. The District would get all of its money back. Not a dime would remain unpaid. All you do is simply say, if you should adopt this amendment, "We are willing to not embarrass the District Commissioners." The Legion has agreed to come here on the theory that it would get the money. All arrangements have been made for the convention. No harm can come anywhere. I am frank to say that I am shocked and surprised that anybody would object to the District Commissioners spending \$25,000 of their own money to entertain the ex-servicemen of World War I and World War II.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan insist on his point of order?

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Michigan does insist on his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Upon the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas just made to the Chair that there is no authorization for the amendment, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in order to explain the situation involving the amendment recently offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, I would like to state this:

As I understand, in 1952 the then Commissioners made a commitment to the extent that they thought the District of Columbia would provide \$25,000 for the 1954 American Legion Convention. In the interim, the plans for the convention have moved along. Whether or not we approve this amount, I am certain and positive that the Legion convention will be held in the District of Columbia.

It has been almost 2 years since the District of Columbia Commissioners made the commitment that they would provide \$25,000 for the Legion convention. It would have been the orderly procedure not to wait 2 years following that commitment for this issue to arise on the floor of the House. The legislative committees of the House and Senate having jurisdiction over District of Columbia business, if they had been alert to their responsibility, could well have taken the necessary legislative action so that we on the Committee on Appropriations would not now be called upon to do what they should have done. They

could have approved, if it was desirable and justifiable, the necessary authorizing legislation permitting the District of Columbia commissioners to obligate the District to the \$25,000 commitment. But, for some reason or other, the District of Columbia Legislative Committees have failed to take the necessary action. I do not think we, of the Committee on Appropriations, at this late date should bail them out. If they still want to take the necessary legislative action, they can go ahead and do it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make another point. If you will look at page 32 of the hearings, you will notice this language:

In 1953, the city of St. Louis, Mo., requesting the convention for that year, assured the committee of a State appropriation of \$40,000. However, this was tied up in the legislature and as no funds were available from the city, it is my information that the city fathers assisted in raising \$39,000 of which 65 percent was returned to the contributors.

In my own city in Michigan, we have quite a convention-minded community. We are very glad to have the conventions come to our community and we do have a number of them each and every year. I do not recall that the convention bureau has gone to the city commission to ask any contribution by the taxpayers of that community to subsidize any convention coming to our community. As a rule, when a large convention comes, the business people in the city, if they need extra funds to attract these desirable conventions, step up and make the outlay and then are reimbursed from any moneys which are brought in as a result of the convention. It seems to me that the business people of the District of Columbia in this instance could go out and raise the necessary \$25,000 and see to it that the American Legion, of which I am a member, will not have any financial problems prior to the convention coming here.

One other point, Mr. Chairman. If we, without the necessary authorizing legislation, allow this \$25,000 to stand as a rider on an appropriation bill, this Congress from here on will be called upon to make similar contributions to other organizations that want to come here. I think it is fine that the Legion should come to the District of Columbia. I am for it. But, I feel if we handle this matter in this way, we will be perpetually called upon by this precedent to do the same for other highly desirable and worthwhile organizations, such as the American Legion is.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HYDE:

On page 22, line 20, strike out "\$1,124,365" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,393,665."

On page 22, line 20, strike out "\$135,406" and insert in lieu thereof "\$404,706."

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill. There is no authority of law for the District of Columbia to enter into a new activity of this kind, and a new business venture. Therefore, the subcommittee

saw fit to eliminate that from the bill, and I make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to make this statement. The amendment, which is before the Committee and which the Chair now has before him, simply increases the amount of money in the bill. Does the gentleman from Indiana make a point of order against increasing the amount of money in the bill?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that it was for the purpose of starting the District of Columbia in the parking business. If I may reserve my point of order until the gentleman explains what the purpose of his amendment is, of course I will be in a better position to speak against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized to speak on his amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I will say, of course, that the gentleman from Indiana is correct so far as the purpose of the amendment for an increase in the amount of this item in the appropriation bill. However, I do not think it is subject to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Indiana because it is simply increasing an amount appropriated and, therefore, would not, of course, be legislation on an appropriation bill.

As has been stated, the purpose of the increase is to permit the District of Columbia to make a start in the establishment of fringe parking in the District of Columbia. The problem of transportation generally, and public transportation in particular, has been a matter with which I have been concerned for some time and concerning which I have introduced legislation in this House. The District of Columbia would like to start to try to get some control of the traffic problem in the District of Columbia. What it wants to do is to set up parking areas in certain fringe locations for all-day parking. In connection with that, of course, the public transportation system will have to provide the necessary transportation to the downtown area. I do not think it needs to be said to any Member of this House that the traffic situation in downtown District of Columbia is rapidly becoming impossible. The reason given by the committee for striking this item out of the bill is this: They say, and I quote from page 7 of their report:

That in view of past experience with this type of program the committee is doubtful of its ultimate success, and believes it desirable to study other cities' experiences for another year or two before undertaking a large investment for this purpose.

That is their reason for deleting this at this time. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot compare adequately the experience of one city with another in this particular problem, because the circumstances in each city are different. The nature of the transportation that is provided, whether or not charges are made, how much those charges amount to, and all that sort of thing are things with which each individual city itself must experiment and see how it works best.

I may say in connection with this particular item that the operators of private parking lots who are represented on the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency, have agreed to go along with this, because this will take care of the all-day parker who cannot afford or does not want to use the commercial facilities now provided in downtown Washington. It will take care of those people now using the public streets who park out in the outer areas. It is a problem with which every great city of this Nation is confronted.

As I gather from the hearings before the Appropriations Committee there was no opposition whatever to this proposition. It is a subject with which this great city must deal. This is an important thing to bear in mind, that this will not cost the taxpayers one cent, because they already have the money in their operating fund, money that they have received from parking meters and other parking charges that are made. I think they have something over a million dollars in that fund today. Here we are simply using \$269,000 of that for the purpose of dealing with this very grave problem. As I understand it, they use only \$20,000 or \$30,000 for the first 5 or 6 months, to see how it catches on, if at all. Certainly this Congress should give the District of Columbia the opportunity of trying to deal with this very grave problem of parking and traffic in the downtown area of the city.

I sincerely hope that the Committee will adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I still insist on the point of order on the ground that the appropriation is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that if the money is unauthorized it is ineffective. The Chair is also of the opinion that the money can be used only for the items included in the bill and as authorized by law.

The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I insist that the amendment be defeated because were the money appropriated it could not be used; therefore, there is no good at all in adding this much more money for them to spend.

I note further that this experiment was tried by the District Commissioners one time, and it failed. I think that was some 10 or 12 years ago. They came back and asked to be enabled to make another experiment. They tried this experiment. It just did not work, and they gave us no reason to believe that they had anything better to offer at this time than they had previously.

Mr. HYDE. If the gentleman from Indiana will give me time to answer, I will be glad to answer him. I am not trying to answer the gentleman now.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I will accept the gentleman's answer.

I insist that we vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to question the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana, pertaining to one phase of the appropriation bill.

It has been brought to my attention that \$35,000 was eliminated from the appropriation that would have provided for the student driver training program here in the District of Columbia. Will the gentleman please enlighten me on that subject?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I did not quite get the gentleman's question; would the gentleman repeat it?

Mr. KEARNS. I said that it has been brought to my attention that \$35,000 has been eliminated from the appropriation that had been used for the student driver training courses here in the District of Columbia. Can the gentleman enlighten me as to that?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. That is another one of those functions where you could increase services to an unlimited extent. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], that for several months we have been hearing about the tremendous savings that the District of Columbia was going to experience under the Reorganization Act. Every one of those savings, however, has reflected another increase.

They brought in statistics to show how much this student driver training program cut down the accident rate. I asked them the basis of those statistics and for comparisons. They claimed that their drivers trained under this course did not have the accidents the others had, but they could not convince me that that was due to the driver training program in the schools. It was probably due to the fact that some children go to school longer than others, that some parents can afford automobiles and others cannot; that some children have training back home and others do not.

I think this is a responsibility that could well be reserved to the parents who are responsible for the children and to the parents who are responsible for damages caused by accidents in which their car is involved, and for the maintenance of the automobile. I am not quite willing to go along with the theory that we should relieve the home, the father and mother of all responsibilities in training children.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the gentleman realize that in almost every community in the United States they have this driver training program? Does the gentleman tell me that the Superintendent of Schools did not appear before your committee and stress the importance of this program?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The Superintendent of Schools did not refer to the driver training program.

Mr. KEARNS. Then that is gross negligence on the part of the Superintendent of Schools in not stressing the importance of this program. I have no criticism of the chairman but I do criti-

cize the Superintendent of Schools for not including this item in the budget here in the District of Columbia, if that is the case.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Would the gentleman go so far as to say that the District of Columbia ought to furnish baby carts and baby pushers to the parents of the District?

Mr. KEARNS. I think that is a little ridiculous.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I do not think it is ridiculous at all.

Mr. KEARNS. Look at the record. Most every city in the United States has a school driving program.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HALLECK] having resumed the chair, Mr. McGREGOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9517) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to demand a rollcall on this amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in connection with the pending bill and the amendment be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMUNIST BEACHHEAD IN GUATEMALA CREATES PERIL TO WESTERN HEMISPHERE—MUST BE DEALT WITH PROMPTLY AND FIRMLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the bold Communist intervention in Latin America is a threat to the security of the Americas and cannot be tolerated. It calls for firm and positive action—action by the United States and concerted action by the Inter-American states.

Today I want to discuss the history and some of the background of Soviet

plotting and plans—plans which bear fruit in the Latin American Republic of Guatemala today. The Kremlin is leaving no stone unturned in advancing its insidious cause on this continent. We, of course, know of the vast scope of Communist activities here in the United States. But let us trace some of their scheming south of the border—from the Rio Grande to the Panama Canal.

COMMUNIST OCTOPUS SPREADS

The important thing to remember is that what has happened in Guatemala has not been an accidental occurrence. It is a significant outcropping of years of intrigue, infiltration, plotting, and planning by a Moscow-directed scheme to shut out civil rights and gain a substantial foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

It is well known that Soviet Russia has been attempting since as far back as 1934 to establish a base of operations in this part of the world. For a long time those efforts to the south centered in Cuba. But the Communists received a set-back there when on March 10, 1952, General Batista seized power. The Reds have not been able to function with any visible evidence of success under the Batista regime.

And the international conspiracy has striven hard for a foothold in Mexico, but with very limited success. The Mexican people love freedom. They are essentially a religious people, and the rank and file are strongly anti-Communist. Most of the Soviet power there is reported to be centered in the labor leader, Vicente Lombardo Toledano. It is reliably reported that the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City, along with those of her captive satellites there, acts as a headquarters for Communist fifth-column activity throughout Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean Islands, with a sort of subheadquarters in Guatemala. Further to the south, the Kremlin is said to use the Czech Legation in Buenos Aires as the seat of South American operations.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

Through this network arrangement some results are noted. It is well to remember, in an appraisal of these developments, that the Marxist, regardless of where he may be, regards himself as belonging first to the Soviet universal state and not to his own country.

Evidences of these activities have been cropping up for some time. The Communist hand was shown last April, for example, in the attempt to assassinate the vehement anti-Communist President Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua. That government reported that the Reds had a hand in that plot. At about the same time Nicaraguan agents discovered Soviet-marked guns, believed to have been smuggled in by submarines.

Nicaragua and the Hondurases form a buffer between Communist-dominated Guatemala and the Panama Canal. We know that in Honduras a strike of north-coast banana workers paralyzed that Nation's economy. There is strong evidence that, while it may have had some local economic basis, it was masterminded by foreign agents, probably operating from Guatemala.

Communist labor leaders seem quite able to close the big copper mines in Chile, another evidence of their growing strength. And it is well known that communism is strong among certain miners of Bolivia, our only large source of tin in the Western Hemisphere.

In nearby Venezuela it is known that Communists are influential among oil workers and that they have established themselves in mining, transportation, and port unions there.

These Soviet-directed activities are well dispersed. The uprising in British Guiana last October is another example. The press reported that Moscow's Guatemalan agents aided the left-wing People's United Party to win 8 or 9 seats in the British Honduras Legislature not long ago. And the same crowd tried to spark a strike on the vast banana plantations there.

The Soviet stooges have also shown their hand in Jamaica and in Trinidad, in the Caribbean. They reportedly hold most of the important offices in two of the French islands in the Caribbean, Martinique and Guadeloupe.

These farflung activities are but symptoms of the Kremlin's plotting. There are many economic ills in the area and the Reds always seek to capitalize upon those in poverty-stricken or unfortunate circumstances.

RED AGENTS TRAVEL TO RUSSIA

As the Kremlin's conspiracy has been stepped up, there has been a noticeable increase in travel by the Red agents from various Central American countries to Moscow. It is reported that these local adherents of the Soviet universal state are now traveling to the land of the Iron Curtain at the rate of about 1,000 per year, about twice as many as were making pilgrimage in 1952. Even in Cuba, where the climate has not been to the liking of the Communists, the party members are permitted to travel to Russia and the satellites.

Guatemalan Communist leaders, including Jose Manuel Fortuny, Victor Manuel Guerrez, Carlos Manuel Pellicer, Mario Silva Jonama, and Jose Alberto Cardoza, are known to have visited Moscow, some of them several times. This travel is sponsored by Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo, the chief Soviet agency in that country, which controls all labor unions and dominates the Government. At least 6 of the 11 committee members of that outfit are known to have visited Russia during the past year.

COMMUNIST LINE FOLLOWED

The teaching obtained on such missions is reflected in the line that is followed. Following Moscow orders, the local Communist leaders return to their respective countries to play upon the prejudices of the people, focusing their attention upon the illiterate and the unfortunate. They do not want to help those people. They seek to use them in promoting their diabolical plots against freedom of those whom they pretend to want to help.

That some indoctrination and training is reflected again in vicious attacks upon the United States. Uncle Sam is pictured by the Kremlin agents as a monster, interested only in protecting

investments of Wall Street monopolies that have gobbled up the richest Latin American resources. They preach that kind of buncombe through local Communist papers and they scream the line at union meetings and at rallies sponsored by the familiar Communist peace committees. On such occasions they blame all their economic ills on the United States. They refer to our foreign aid to Europe and Asia but bemoan the fact that but limited assistance is received locally.

SOVIET PLAN

From the Soviet viewpoint, there is an objective for every move that is made. Their primary purpose is to promote international communism, dished out from Moscow. In concentrating so much attention to Central America at this time they would like to divert the attention of the United States to our own backyard and away from the Reds' more important current operation in southeast Asia. With strength established in Latin America, the Soviets dream of submarine bases and of their ability to shut off vital materials from being imported into this country by means of strikes and sabotage of mines, refineries and ports.

And it must be remembered that the Panama Canal is only 2 hours' flying time from Guatemala. If the Soviets should force a global war to ignite, they are most anxious to use their puppets in that area of this continent as bases for sabotage and attack.

LATIN AMERICANS ANTI-COMMUNIST

But the Moscow conspirators know the going is not easy among the 160 million religious-minded, freedom-loving peoples of Central America. They know that 13 of the 20 Latin American Republics have outlawed the Communist Party. They know that the Communist Party in that area is actually smaller in numbers than it was right after World War II. But they are using their familiar techniques of deceit and fraud in trying to fool the people into complacency and non-resistance to their well-placed and Moscow-trained agents and coconspirators.

COMMUNISTS CONTROL GUATEMALA

We now know, Mr. Speaker, that the real Communist beachhead in this hemisphere has been established in Guatemala. It began to take form with the election in 1950 of Col. Jacobo Arbenz. Right after that the Communists came out into the open. They were encouraged. The Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo—PGT—the chief Soviet agency, has Government support. It is given free use of public buildings, automobiles, and subsidized Government advertising. It is reported that a daily Communist newspaper, Tribuna Popular, began publication on a press provided free by the Government. Government-approved student and youth organizations are under complete Communist domination.

Russia even maintains a propaganda vehicle in the National Peace Committee. The Reds control the radio, publicity, social security, and they completely dominate the labor unions. Alfonso Solorzano, a well-known Communist who was formerly associated with

Mexico's Toledano, has been in charge of Guatemala's social-security system for some time. And the Agrarian Reform Bureau, which parcels out land under expropriation powers, is under Communist direction. The department's Secretary General has been Senora Marie de Fortuny, wife of Manuel Fortuny, one of the top Communist moguls in Guatemala. There is a reliable report that associates the President's wife with the active Red network down there.

PEOPLE LIKE FREEDOM

But there is yet hope for Guatemala in the fact that the rank and file of the people love liberty. There are actually not many card carriers. Time magazine set the number of party members in that country at 536, and the National Planning Association, after a careful survey, estimated party members and fellow travelers to be no more than 2,000 to 3,000. But, as I have pointed out, the party leaders have been able to worm their way into strategic spots, thereby arrogating to themselves influence and power far out of proportion to their numerical strength.

There is hope when the people there learn—as indeed reports indicate they are learning—that they have been sold down the river by agents of a foreign power acting through the present government. All is not going well for the Communists in Guatemala. The Government's traditional strong fiscal position has been replaced by a sizable public debt. Private capital has been driven from the country, taking with it jobs and opportunities. The tourist trade, the source of much revenue, has declined and some agricultural production has suffered. In the name of agrarian reform the Communist-controlled Agrarian Bureau has expropriated some 450,000 acres of land, half of which was owned by the American-owned United Fruit Co. A figure of \$2 per acre was assessed for this land, actually valued by the company at \$16 million. But only a few of the 86 percent of Guatemalan citizens who are landless have benefited from this grab. It is understandable that reports persist of a probable outburst of resistance against the Sovietized actions of the present regime.

SOVIETS ARM GUATEMALA

In a bold and calculated move, Soviet Russia has recently sent a vast shipment of guns and ammunition to their outpost in Guatemala. Obviously not intended for any normal needs of its small 6,000-man army, the cargo of rifles, automatic arms, mortars, and light artillery, with large quantities of ammunition, all valued at \$10 million, was received a fortnight ago at Guatemala's Caribbean port of Puerto Barrios. Listed on the ship's manifest as "steel rods, optical glass, and laboratory supplies," in 15,000 cases, the Swedish freighter *Alphem* eased its cargo into the port after zig-zagging from the port of origin, Stettin, Poland.

Thus, in one fell swoop, Guatemala, with but 3 million people, became the major military power in Central America. The first recorded shipment of Iron Curtain guns reached the Western Hemisphere. With this vast quantity of war

materials, Guatemala became several times as strong as any other country in Central America.

WHAT USE THIS WAR MATERIAL?

What is behind this buildup of war materials? What will it be used for? There are, of course, many possibilities. First, the Guatemalan Army will be armed and become a serious threat to the peace of the area. At the same time it may well be used to create a police state, Communist style, to perpetuate a Communist-dominated government in power—regardless of the will of the people. It is expected that a part of it will be smuggled into subversive hands inside neighboring countries.

It is significant that this vast storehouse of war material was received only 3 weeks preceding the dictatorial suspension of all constitutional rights of the people—a move associated with police-state tactics.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Now, Mr. Speaker, what can be done about all this? Already the State Department has cut off technical and other aid to this southern neighbor. We know many of the Latin American countries are gravely concerned and are becoming fully aware of their peril. There is, however, evidence of some complacency on the part of some of the Central American governments where a wait and see policy seems preferred. But we know that a policy of delay and procrastination in dealing with the situation is dangerous.

As I see it, possible actions include: First. A concerted drive, spearheaded through diplomatic channels, to expose the real intentions of the Kremlin and to identify developments in Guatemala with Communist orders issued in Moscow.

Second. Action could, of course, be taken by the Organization of American States. It will be recalled that the Rio Pact of 1947 provides for effective reciprocal assistance in the event of foreign aggression against any American state, including aggression which is not an armed attack. Such action would conform with the anti-Communist declaration adopted 4 months ago at the Tenth Inter-American Conference at Caracas.

The press reports that Secretary of State Dulles favors such a meeting, and that it will probably be held at Montevideo, Uruguay, by a conference of foreign ministers, on July 1. It is encouraging to note that Mexico is agreeable to such a meeting. There possible courses of united action against Guatemala would be considered.

Third. The fullest possible cooperation, in the form of encouraging private investments, loans, technical assistance, trade arrangements with friendly Central American countries. Our Government has been pursuing that policy for a long time, but the opportunities should be reexamined in the light of recent developments in Guatemala.

Fourth. The application of economic sanctions, entailing a possible boycott of the commodities produced by the Soviet's most recent outpost, Guatemala, and a boycott against the shipment of goods

into that country. This course could, of course, be tremendously effective. It is assumed this alternative will be considered at Montevideo.

Fifth. The invocation of the Monroe Doctrine. Since 1823 this country, under that doctrine, has made it clear that it will protect this hemisphere against foreign intervention. Now, for the first time in a hundred years, such an intervention by a foreign power has taken place. We must face up to it. The job will be made much easier by the united cooperation of other American states, all of whom have a common interest to be served by recognizing that intervention for what it is and then taking immediate steps to do something about it.

GUATEMALAN FOREIGN TRADE

In considering the application of economic sanctions, it is of interest to review the foreign trade situation in Guatemala. During 1953 imports into that country were valued at \$79,539,000, and exports were valued at \$88,922,000. The United States accounted for \$63,163,000 of the exports and \$44,280,000 of the goods sold to Guatemala came from this country. Thus a major portion of that trade was with the United States. Our markets and our exportable commodities constitute the mainstay of the economic existence of Guatemala today. If need be, and as an effective means of invoking the Monroe Doctrine, in order to defeat the Soviet invasion of Guatemala, our trade with that country should be brought to a complete halt—and that boycott should be firmly enforced.

Economic sanctions applied to any nation is a drastic move. But drastic action is called for in coping with this grave threat to the peace and security of this entire hemisphere. This Nation cannot afford to permit international communism to intervene, take over, and operate a government in the Western Hemisphere, imperil our peace and security, and jeopardize the freedom and self-respect of millions of people.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Texas, who is one of the ablest men in the House of Representatives and one of the best informed members of the Committee on Armed Services, on the fine presentation that he has made, and I wish to associate myself with his views.

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and I am pleased to note his interest, which I know has existed for a long time, in the seriousness of the problem growing out of what is happening in Central America today.

LET US PRAY FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the bill, H. R. 9120, to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post

offices of a special cancelling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace."

In introducing this bill to urge that we pray for peace, my mind harkens again and again to the words of a legendary American and patriot, whose name was Abraham Lincoln; his words are as pertinent today as they were then:

We have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown; but we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand that preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior virtue and wisdom of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

It behooves us, then—

He said—

to humble ourselves before the offended power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.

It is my deep conviction that we in the 20th century have forgotten God. New wealth and new blessings have come to us over the decades that would have astounded Lincoln, but he would find nothing new in the same presumptuous pride that afflicts us today.

It would also seem that, in view of the manner in which our country has been catapulted into the role of leadership of the free world, in recognition of the heavy mantle of responsibility which has been thrust upon our shoulders as Americans in the face of the long-continued and ever-increasing attacks upon us by the forces of godlessness and atheism, we need constantly to be reminded of our dependence upon God and of our faith in His support. We need to remember that it is from the wellspring of humility that greatness comes. We need always be aware, as were our Founding Fathers, that there is a Supreme Being who watches over the destinies of men and nations. We need only to approach Him, suppliantly, for the assistance He will give to those who ask for it, to guide an anxious ship of state through troubled waters and into safe harbors beyond. We need a return to basic truths. We need to pray for peace.

It is only proper that the Government of this great Nation, upon which a benign providence has lavished His blessings in an unending stream, should exhort her people and the peoples of the world, through the medium of a cancellation mark upon the face of her mail, with the simple and compelling entreaty, "pray for peace."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. BUCHANAN and to include a statement.

Mr. MCGREGOR.

Mr. STEED.

Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. STEED) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. KLEIN).

Mr. JENKINS and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. LIPSCOMB), for duration of committee assignment, on account of official business of Special Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 11, 1954, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1331. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell;

H. R. 5416. An act to authorize the advancement of certain lieutenants on the retired list of the Navy; and

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 15, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1625. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the 18th Quarterly Report on the administration of the advance planning program, pursuant to Public Law 352, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 433); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

1626. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two copies of the May 28, 1954, letter of comments from the Bureau of the Budget on our report on the Glendo Unit, Wyoming, Missouri River Basin project, which was sent to the Congress on April 2, 1954, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1954 (67 Stat. 266); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1627. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Laguna, and Vicente D. Reynante"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1628. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a list giving the names of aliens covered and copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1629. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill

to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1630. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize removal of the position of Deputy Maritime Administrator from the classified civil service"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1631. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 8, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration on a review of the reports on Siskiwit River, Wis., with a view to determining the advisability of incorporating the maintenance of two breakwater piers at Cornucopia, Wis., into the existing project, and determining if any other modification of the harbor is advisable at this time. This investigation was requested by resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 13, 1948, as amended April 21, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 434); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1632. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 23, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of report on the Mississippi River between Coon Rapids Dam and the mouth of the Ohio River, with a view to determining the advisability of providing flood protection along Bear Creek in Marion and Ralls Counties, Mo., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on June 24, 1947. It is also in partial response to resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on September 18, 1944, in regard to local protection at Hannibal, Mo., from floods on Mississippi River (H. Doc. No. 435); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1633. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 23, 1953, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a survey of Rio Hondo at Roswell, N. Mex., this interim report is submitted under the authority for a preliminary examination and survey of Pecos River and tributaries, Texas and New Mexico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 436); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6340. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8081. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6885. A bill to amend section 1 of Joint Resolution

12 enacted by the 25th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, in the regular session of 1949 and approved by the 81st Congress of the United States of America at the second session (Public Law 746, ch. 833); with amendment (Rept. No. 1857). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5997. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of general obligation bonds, the proceeds thereof to be used for veterans' mortgages; with amendment (Rept. No. 1858). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1012. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for a camp site and other public purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6959. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Baptist Mid-Missions for use as a church site; with amendment (Rept. No. 1853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7958. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Harding Lake Camp, Inc., of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use as a youth camp and related purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 9545. A bill to provide hospital care for certain veterans residing in the Philip-

pine Islands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 9546. A bill to protect the rights of vessels of the United States on the high seas and in territorial waters of foreign countries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 9547. A bill to provide that certain lands acquired by the United States shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 9548. A bill to repeal the act approved September 25, 1914, and to amend the act approved June 12, 1934, both relating to alley dwellings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 9549. A bill to provide that the special fourth-class postage rates for books shall apply to certain 16-page instructional publications; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. Res. 582. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House to provide that the pledge of allegiance to the flag shall be rendered at the beginning of each day's sitting; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 22, deploring the unwarranted and unprecedented abuse of power by the United States Supreme Court in the antisegregation decision handed down on May 17, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9550. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dvora Gershkovitz and Moisha Gershkovitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 9551. A bill for the relief of Ektor Dikeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 9552. A bill for the relief of the Theobald Industries, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 9553. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nina Camarata, Florence Camarata, Joseph Camarata, and Louis Camarata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1008. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 155 employees of Conway yards, the Pennsylvania Railroad, Conway, Pa., urging passage of H. R. 5269; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1009. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 14 residents of Hardin and Marshall Counties, Iowa, favoring the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1010. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Long Branch Woman's Club, Long Branch, N. J., pledging full support of President Eisenhower's proposal for an International Atomic Energy Agency; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1011. Also, petition of the Secretary, Union Printers' League of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J., relative to being placed on record as protesting as discriminatory, uncharitable, and unfair the ruling made by the Internal Revenue Department, which places taxes on union pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1012. Also, petition of the president of the Senate of the Republic of Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico, relative to transmitting a folder setting forth the viewpoints of the Society Amigos de Guatemala de Mexico concerning the defense of Guatemala at the 10th Pan-American Conference held at Caracas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

House Resolution 521

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on April 29 I introduced what is now known as House Resolution 521, the intent of which was to bring an end to peacetime draft and form the basis for a volunteer professional military establishment.

Peacetime draft, the present system of making up the strength of the Armed Forces, is inequitable, expensive, and inefficient. My resolution, Mr. Speaker, directs the Committee on Armed Serv-

ices to make a full and complete investigation of the pay, allowances and so-called fringe benefits endeavoring to work out a program calculated to attract volunteers to a military career. This investigation would have two principal objectives: First, to provide benefits for military personnel approximately equal to those which could be obtained in civilian life and, second, to attract career personnel into the Armed Forces in numbers sufficient to maintain them on a volunteer basis except in time of war. This procedure would provide our country with professional armed units which would be familiar with up-to-date and modern weapons that are being developed from year to year. In this way, those reaching service age would have the opportunity of selecting a military or civilian career. The program would

save money, give adequate defense, and go a long way in preventing economic disruption.

Dixie Gilmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join with my colleagues in paying a small word of tribute to a former colleague from my State. I have known Dixie Gilmer for many